Capitalism versus Socialism

Jan Lavrinovski

All rights reserved

Contents

The Historical Battlefield – Class Struggle and the Rise of Capitalism.....1
The Machinery of Exploitation – The Nature of Capital and Labor.....7
The Engine of Inequality – Accumulation and Alienation.....14
The Bourgeois Ideology – Illusions, Power, and False Freedom.....21
Scientific Socialism – Marx and Engels' Theory of Revolutionary Change.....29
The Proletariat as the Revolutionary Subject – Organization and Struggle.....37
Beyond Capital – The Socialist Future and Human Emancipation.....45
Sources..... 52

The Historical Battlefield – Class Struggle and the Rise of Capitalism

History is not a collection of detached events or a theater of great men; it is the living record of material life unfolding through struggle. Against the idealist conception of history, which imagines ideas, religions, or abstract moral progress as the motive force of human development, Marx and Engels asserted a radically different framework: historical materialism. This method begins not with what people think, but with what they do to survive. It roots human history in the concrete conditions of life—how food is grown, how shelter is made, how tools are produced, and most crucially, how labor is organized. It insists that the dominant ideas of any age are not autonomous truths but the ideological reflections of the ruling class's interests.

At the heart of this approach lies a central truth: the history of all hitherto existing societies is the history of class struggles. From ancient slave societies to feudal kingdoms, and now to capitalist empires, human history is a battlefield shaped by antagonisms between those who produce and those who appropriate the fruits of that labor. Classes are not mere social categories; they are relations to the means of production. One class owns and controls those means—the land, tools, factories—while the other must sell its labor to survive. This relationship is not cooperative but exploitative, and it defines the structure of society at every level: economic, political, and ideological.

In *The German Ideology*, Marx and Engels tore away the veil of philosophical idealism that had dominated German thought. They argued that philosophers had interpreted the world by spinning elaborate mental systems while ignoring the real, material conditions of life. Against this, they declared that social being determines consciousness—not the reverse. People do not live in a world created by their ideas; rather, they form their ideas within the world shaped by their material existence. Religion, law, art, and philosophy all arise from and serve to stabilize particular social and economic structures.

The formation of class society is not a natural inevitability but the outcome of specific historical developments. In early human communities, property and labor were shared communally. It was only when productive forces developed enough to produce a surplus—more than was needed for immediate survival—that classes emerged. The surplus became a source of power, hoarded and controlled by a minority. This minority no longer labored but lived off the labor of others. Thus began the division of society into oppressors and oppressed: slave and master, lord and serf, capitalist and worker.

This class division did not arise through violence alone, though violence often enforced it. It was sanctified through ideology. Ruling classes do not merely exploit; they create the illusions that justify exploitation. In each epoch, the dominant class crafts a set of ideas—moral codes, religious doctrines, national myths—that present its rule as eternal, natural, and just. These ideas become the common sense of the time, internalized even by the oppressed.

This is why Marx and Engels argued that the ruling ideas of every age are the ideas of its ruling class.

Historical materialism breaks that illusion. It reveals that these ideas are not universal truths but weapons in a social war. By uncovering the material roots of society's development and contradictions, it equips the working class with the knowledge to understand its chains—and the power to break them.

This method is not a dry academic tool; it is revolutionary. It sees history as movement, contradiction, and change. It exposes every social order as temporary, riddled with internal tensions. And it declares that capitalism, like all class systems before it, is not the end of history but a phase already pregnant with its own dissolution. Through historical materialism, we see that a new world is not only possible—it is necessary.

The transition from feudalism to capitalism was not a peaceful transformation but a long and violent rupture that unfolded over centuries. It was born from the slow decay of the medieval world and the emergence of a new social class—the bourgeoisie—whose rise would shatter the feudal order and prepare the ground for modern capitalism. To understand this transformation, we must again look not to the proclamations of kings or the proclamations of philosophers, but to the material forces that reshaped production, trade, and human relations across Europe.

Feudalism was a system rooted in land and tradition. Power flowed from ownership of the soil, and the nobility held dominion over both territory and people. The serfs, bound to the land, labored not for wages but under obligation. Their toil sustained a parasitic aristocracy whose authority was sanctified by religion and inherited through lineage. The Church, as the ideological arm of this system, promised divine order and eternal hierarchy. Yet beneath this surface of stability, the forces of change were gathering. The growth of towns, the revival of trade, and the expansion of handicraft production began to undermine the static, self-contained world of feudal life.

As markets grew, a new class of merchants, artisans, and moneylenders emerged within the cracks of feudal society. They dealt in goods, credit, and exchange—activities that transcended the fixed boundaries of lordly estates. This class, the early bourgeoisie, did not yet wield political power, but it held the key to a new mode of wealth accumulation based on trade and production for profit rather than for subsistence. Every market transaction eroded the personal ties of feudal obligation and replaced them with impersonal relations of exchange. Gold and goods began to speak louder than titles and oaths.

The discovery of new sea routes, the conquest of the Americas, and the establishment of colonial empires accelerated this transformation. The influx of silver and goods from abroad expanded commerce and finance, while the early manufacturing workshops—proto-factories—laid the technical foundation for industrial capitalism. The old nobility, dependent on static rents from land, found itself increasingly indebted to the merchant class that dealt in circulation and capital. Feudal relations, once the natural order of life, became fetters on the expansion of production.

In *The Communist Manifesto*, Marx and Engels vividly described this epoch as the revolutionary triumph of the bourgeoisie. This class, once oppressed by feudal privilege, became itself a revolutionary force. It tore apart the medieval bonds of allegiance and faith that had chained men to the soil and the church. It overthrew monarchs, destroyed guild restrictions, and replaced local self-sufficiency with global interdependence. "The bourgeoisie," they wrote, "has played a most revolutionary part." It created modern industry, modern science, and the world market. It transformed the peasant into the wage laborer and the lord into the capitalist.

Yet this revolution was not driven by ideals of liberty or progress alone, as bourgeois historians often claim. It was driven by necessity—the inner compulsion of the new productive forces that could no longer exist under feudal constraint. The rise of machines, workshops, and trade demanded free labor and movable capital, not fixed obligations and hereditary privilege. The political revolutions of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries—in England, France, and later across Europe—were expressions of this deeper economic transformation. Behind the slogans of freedom and equality stood the material struggle of a new class for domination.

When the bourgeoisie seized power, it remade the world in its own image. It replaced the divine right of kings with the rights of property, the bonds of fealty with the contracts of labor. The marketplace became the new altar, and profit its god. But in doing so, it also unleashed forces it could not fully control: the growing masses of dispossessed workers who, stripped of land and tradition, would one day rise against their new masters.

Thus, capitalism was born not as the culmination of human progress but as a new stage of class rule. It was the triumph of one exploiting class over another. The bourgeois revolution, though it broke the chains of feudalism, forged new ones out of wage labor and capital. In the ruins of the old order, a new battlefield was drawn—the struggle between bourgeois and proletarian, the latest and most decisive conflict in the long history of class society.

The rise of the bourgeoisie marked the most dynamic transformation in the history of productive forces. No previous ruling class had so thoroughly revolutionized the means by which societies produced and reproduced the necessities and luxuries of life. In contrast to the feudal lords who hoarded surplus and stagnated within inherited privilege, the bourgeois class was compelled to expand, innovate, and reshape the world around them through constant revolution in the mode of production. They did not merely inherit power—they created it through the relentless drive for profit, competition, and accumulation. This relentless economic motion gave birth to modern industry and the world market.

According to Marx and Engels in *The Communist Manifesto*, the bourgeoisie played a historically progressive role—at least in its early stages. It tore down the walls of medieval tradition, smashed the chains of guild regulation, and ushered in the age of the machine. Its insatiable thirst for expansion compelled it to revolutionize agriculture, reorganize labor, and build the technical foundation of modern science and production. The bourgeoisie made the factory the new cathedral of labor, the machine its god, and efficiency its holy doctrine. Steam engines, power looms, mechanical presses—these were not simply tools but symbols

of a new epoch in which the productive forces of society were unshackled from the slow rhythm of handcraft and landed tradition.

But the bourgeoisie did not advance these productive forces out of generosity or vision. It did so out of necessity. The market demanded more goods, faster turnover, cheaper labor, and higher profit margins. To survive in competition, the capitalist had no choice but to invest in better machinery, reduce costs, and find new ways to exploit labor more intensively. Every innovation, every technical breakthrough, every extension of the market was both a means of survival and a weapon in the war of capital against labor. The development of productive forces under capitalism is thus not a neutral or benevolent process—it is driven by class antagonism, shaped by exploitation, and subordinated to private profit.

The factory system brought labor together in unprecedented concentrations, transforming work from skilled craftsmanship into alienated, repetitive motion. Workers became appendages of machines, and production was stripped of creativity and autonomy. The same forces that allowed society to produce in abundance also deepened the division between those who owned the means of production and those who had nothing but their labor to sell. The productive forces, now immensely more powerful than in any previous era, were no longer controlled by society for its own ends but by capitalists for their private gain.

At the same time, the expansion of productive capacity was global in scale. The bourgeoisie, Marx and Engels observed, created the world market and made every nation dependent on international trade. This integration of local economies into a single, interlinked system meant that no society could remain untouched by capitalist production. Traditional ways of life were uprooted, small-scale agriculture was destroyed, and domestic industries were crushed under the weight of cheap imports from capitalist centers. The bourgeoisie, in shaping modern productive forces, reshaped the world—socially, politically, ecologically, and economically.

The irony of bourgeois development lies in the contradiction it produces. By creating a system of production that is constantly revolutionizing itself, the bourgeoisie has also created the material conditions for its own negation. The very concentration of workers in factories, the socialization of labor, and the global interdependence of production point toward the possibility of a different kind of economy—one no longer based on competition, but on cooperation; not on private profit, but on collective need.

Thus, the role of the bourgeoisie in shaping modern productive forces is a double-edged legacy. On one side, it unlocked the potential for abundance, scientific advancement, and the mastery of nature. On the other, it did so by chaining human life to the rhythms of capital and laying the foundation for deeper forms of exploitation. The task of the working class, as Marx and Engels made clear, is not to reject these productive forces but to liberate them—from the control of capital, from the system of profit, and from the domination of class society itself.

As capitalism advanced, it did not create a harmonious or stable society. Rather, it deepened the divisions at the heart of human relations and exposed itself to internal contradictions that it could not escape. These contradictions are not accidental flaws in an otherwise functional

system; they are the very engine of its motion and the seeds of its destruction. Capitalism lives by contradiction—between wealth and poverty, abundance and scarcity, social labor and private ownership, freedom in law and domination in life. It cannot exist without crisis, nor without producing the class that will one day overthrow it: the proletariat.

At the core of capitalism lies a fundamental contradiction between the social character of production and the private appropriation of its results. In the factory, thousands of workers cooperate to produce a single commodity, yet the product does not belong to them—it belongs to the capitalist. The labor that created it is collective, but the profit it generates is private. This contradiction intensifies as production becomes more complex and interdependent. While society becomes increasingly organized and productive labor more collective, ownership remains concentrated in the hands of a few. The gap between what society creates and who controls it widens into a chasm.

This contradiction gives rise to the cyclical crises that have plagued capitalism since its birth. Overproduction, not scarcity, becomes the central problem. Goods flood the market, not because human needs have been met, but because workers—exploited and underpaid—cannot afford to buy what they themselves have produced. Factories slow or shut down, workers are thrown into unemployment, and wealth sits idle in the hands of capitalists who seek new ways to squeeze profit from a glutted market. Each crisis wipes away sections of capital and labor alike, only to repeat again with greater intensity. Marx called this the anarchy of capitalist production: a system that expands blindly, driven not by rational planning or human welfare but by the pursuit of accumulation.

From these contradictions arises a new class, forged in the furnace of exploitation—the proletariat. This class is unique in history because it owns no means of production, no land, no tools, no capital. It survives solely by selling its labor power to those who do. Unlike previous oppressed classes, the proletariat is not scattered or isolated. Capitalism itself concentrates workers into great centers of industry, brings them together under the same roof, subjects them to the same rhythms of production, and confronts them with the same conditions of alienation, discipline, and exploitation.

In *The Communist Manifesto*, Marx and Engels describe the proletariat as capitalism's own creation, its gravedigger. The more capitalism expands, the more it proletarianizes the population. Peasants are uprooted from the land, artisans are destroyed by mechanization, small capitalists are ruined by competition—and all are thrust into the ranks of wage labor. The proletariat is thus not a marginal group but the majority in formation, bound together not by tradition or ideology but by common material interest and shared social conditions. In every struggle over wages, hours, and working conditions, the class begins to recognize itself, not only as a group of individuals under similar pressure, but as a collective force capable of transformation.

Moreover, the contradictions of capitalism are not limited to economics. They spill into every sphere of life—into politics, where democracy masks the rule of capital; into ideology, where freedom is declared but denied; into the family, where even love and intimacy are shaped by economic necessity. The capitalist system, in its totality, reveals itself as a prison built from

profit and guarded by law, ideology, and coercion. Yet within that prison, the key lies hidden: the collective power of those who keep its engines running.

Thus, the birth of the proletariat is the birth of possibility. In creating the working class, capitalism has created the only force capable of abolishing class society altogether. The contradiction between capital and labor is not only the central drama of our time—it is the gateway through which a new world can emerge.

In the relentless struggle between labor and capital, capitalism has revealed not only its brutal contradictions but also its historic limits. It can no longer be seen as the final stage of social development, nor its crises as anomalies to be corrected by reform. Rather, they are signs of its obsolescence—proof that it has outlived its progressive role in history. For centuries, class antagonism has been the driving force of social evolution. Each ruling class in history has built its power on the exploitation of those below it. But capitalism, in organizing production on a vast scale and concentrating workers into a unified class, has prepared the way for a new social order—one in which class itself can be abolished. That new order is socialism.

Socialism does not emerge from moral outrage alone, nor from abstract ideals of justice. It arises from the material conditions created by capitalism itself. The contradiction between collective production and private appropriation becomes, under socialism, a unity: what is produced by all is owned by all. The very socialized nature of labor under capitalism—its complex interdependence, its technical sophistication, its global scale—demands a form of ownership that matches it. Socialism is not a step backward to primitive communality, nor a utopian dream unmoored from reality. It is the next rational stage in the development of human society, grounded in the real movement of history.

In *The German Ideology*, Marx and Engels demonstrated that communism is not an abstract schema to be imposed upon the world, but the real movement that abolishes the present state of things. It is the outcome of class struggle, not its denial. It emerges not from ideals imposed from above but from the daily struggle of workers who come to understand that their exploitation is not a personal misfortune but a structural condition. Through strikes, revolts, and the growth of working-class consciousness, the proletariat begins to grasp its historic role —not merely as victims of the system, but as its potential destroyers.

The abolition of private property in the means of production is the first act of socialist transformation. This does not mean the seizure of personal possessions, as bourgeois propaganda often suggests, but the expropriation of the expropriators—the end of a system where a minority owns factories, land, and capital while the majority labors to survive. With this step, production can be reoriented from the system of profit to the satisfaction of human needs. Planning replaces chaos, cooperation replaces competition, and the wealth of society is directed toward its enrichment as a whole.

Socialism is also the end of alienated labor. Under capitalism, work is a burden, imposed from above, stripped of creativity, and governed by the clock. In a socialist society, where production is organized democratically and collectively, labor can be transformed. It becomes

a means not only of survival but of self-realization. Education, science, and art—once accessible only to the privileged—become the common inheritance of all.

But socialism is not an endpoint. As Marx and Engels noted, it is the transition phase between capitalism and full communism. It is still a period of class struggle, but now under the conditions of workers' rule. The state, once the instrument of bourgeois domination, is transformed into a tool for suppressing the remnants of the old order and organizing the new. Yet even this state, born of revolution, is destined to disappear. For once class distinctions are abolished, the need for a coercive apparatus disappears. In its place arises a free association of producers, coordinating their activity for the good of all—a society without rulers, without exploiters, without the chains of history.

Thus, socialism is not merely a vision. It is the conscious resolution of the contradictions within capitalism, the historical answer to class society itself. Where capitalism has created despair, it opens the door to hope. Where it has imposed division, it plants the seeds of unity. And where it has built a world on the suffering of many for the luxury of a few, socialism calls for a new beginning—for a society rooted not in domination but in liberation.

The Machinery of Exploitation – The Nature of Capital and Labor

The foundation of capitalist society rests upon a simple unit: the commodity. At first glance, a commodity appears as a mundane object—clothing, tools, food, or machinery—something produced to satisfy human need. But as Marx demonstrated in the opening pages of *Capital*, the commodity is far more than a useful object. It is the cell form of capitalism, where the basic social relations of the system are hidden beneath the surface of things. Understanding the commodity is the first step in unraveling the system of capital.

A commodity has two essential aspects: use-value and exchange-value. Use-value refers to its capacity to satisfy a human want. This quality is concrete, specific, and tied to physical characteristics. A coat keeps one warm, a hammer drives nails, a loaf of bread ends hunger. But under capitalism, things are not produced simply for their utility. They are produced for exchange—sold on the market for money. This exchangeability gives rise to a second property: exchange-value, which expresses the relative worth of one commodity in relation to others.

What, then, determines this exchange-value? It cannot be the physical substance of the commodity, for objects of entirely different kinds are routinely exchanged—corn for iron, labor for food, shoes for shelter. Nor can it be derived from supply and demand alone, for these fluctuate and only explain short-term variations. Marx identifies the source of value in the one element all commodities share in their production: human labor.

The labor theory of value holds that the value of a commodity is determined by the socially necessary labor time required for its production. This means not just any labor, but labor measured under normal conditions, using average skill and productivity, within a given

society. It is not the individual effort of a lone worker that determines value, but the general labor conditions shaped by the productive forces of a society at a given moment.

Labor is thus the substance of value, but this value is expressed in the form of exchange—through money. In this way, the commodity hides the social relation behind a material form. The coat no longer appears as the product of a tailor's labor, but as an object with a price. In capitalist society, labor itself becomes a commodity—labor power bought and sold like any other input. This peculiar twist lies at the heart of exploitation, for it is not the object but the process that capitalism transforms.

Marx called this phenomenon "commodity fetishism." In capitalist society, the products of human labor appear to possess value independently, as if value were an inherent property of things. The relations between people become relations between things. A machine appears valuable not because of the labor that built it, but because of its price tag. This mystification is essential to the functioning of capitalism. It hides exploitation beneath the appearance of fairness—an exchange of equivalents—when in fact, the value created exceeds the value paid.

The labor theory of value unmasks this illusion. It shows that behind every commodity is human labor, and that in every transaction of capital lies a concealed inequality. It explains why the worker, though legally free and equal under capitalism, is in reality subordinate to a system that appropriates the wealth they create. It explains why profit is not a reward for risk or ingenuity, but a portion of labor time unpaid to the worker. It reveals that the economic laws of capitalism are not eternal truths, but historical expressions of class domination.

In understanding the commodity, its value, and its origin in labor, we come face to face with the central contradiction of capitalism: it presents itself as a system of freedom and exchange, yet rests upon exploitation and dispossession. The commodity, seemingly simple, becomes the gateway to a deeper comprehension of the mechanics of capital and the social order it sustains. From this point, the machinery of exploitation can be dissected with scientific precision.

The secret of capitalist profit does not lie in buying cheap and selling dear, nor in clever tricks of commerce, nor in the randomness of the market. It lies in the exploitation of labor—the extraction of surplus value from the worker. Surplus value is the lifeblood of capital, the invisible thread that binds the worker to the capitalist, not as an equal in exchange but as a source of unpaid labor time. Marx's analysis in *Capital* strips away the illusions of fairness and contract that veil the true nature of this relationship.

To understand surplus value, we must first distinguish between labor and labor power. The worker does not sell their labor—an activity—but their labor power, the capacity to work for a given period. This distinction is crucial. The capitalist purchases this capacity at its value, which is determined like any other commodity: by the amount of socially necessary labor time required to produce it. In this case, that means the cost of the worker's subsistence—food, shelter, clothing, and other essentials needed to maintain their ability to work and reproduce their class.

Suppose the value of this labor power amounts to six hours of labor per day. The capitalist pays the worker a wage that reflects this—an apparently fair exchange. But once employed, the worker does not stop after six hours. They labor for eight, ten, or twelve. The value they create during those additional hours is not paid to them. It is appropriated by the capitalist in full. This unpaid portion of the working day is the source of surplus value.

The capitalist thus buys labor power for less than the value it creates. The difference between what the worker is paid and the value they produce is surplus value. It is not the result of cheating or theft in a narrow legal sense, but of a structural relationship embedded in the wage system itself. Every act of wage labor is a transaction where the capitalist profits by paying for less than they receive in return.

Surplus value takes various forms: profit, interest, and rent. But these are only appearances—ways in which surplus value is divided among different factions of the capitalist class. Whether it is the factory owner, the banker, or the landlord, all derive their wealth not from their own labor but from the surplus labor of the working class. They live off what others produce.

Capital, therefore, is not simply accumulated wealth. It is accumulated labor, stored up in the form of machines, tools, buildings, and money—but labor extracted under conditions of exploitation. When capital is invested, it is not merely applied to production; it enters into a relation with labor that is inherently antagonistic. The capitalist seeks to maximize surplus value through longer hours, intensified work, and the introduction of machinery to reduce dependence on skilled labor and increase output.

There are two primary ways to extract surplus value. The first is absolute surplus value—extending the working day so that more hours go unpaid. The second is relative surplus value—reducing the value of labor power itself by lowering the cost of necessities, often through increased productivity. In both cases, the goal is the same: to increase the gap between what the worker is paid and what the worker produces.

This process is not accidental or optional. It is the mechanism through which capital reproduces itself. Profit is not an external reward for risk or investment—it is the unpaid portion of labor, systematized and normalized by wage relations. It is what gives capitalism its dynamic power and its destructive contradictions. For in seeking ever greater surplus, capital must constantly drive down labor costs, replace workers with machines, and expand into new markets—while also relying on those same workers as consumers.

Thus, the extraction of surplus value is the engine of capitalist accumulation, but also the source of its instability and injustice. It reveals why poverty persists in the midst of wealth, why growth breeds inequality, and why the working class, though essential to production, remains excluded from the wealth it creates. Surplus value is not just an economic concept—it is a measure of exploitation and the basis for a system that must be overturned if labor is to be freed.

One of capitalism's most profound deceptions lies in its ability to conceal the social character of labor behind the veil of things. Marx called this phenomenon the fetishism of commodities—a mystification where the relationships between people appear as relationships between objects, and the labor that gives value to products becomes invisible. In capitalist society, the true nature of human relations is not merely hidden—it is inverted, distorted, and made to appear as natural, eternal, and independent of human will.

The term "fetishism" was borrowed by Marx from anthropology, where it described the worship of material objects believed to hold supernatural power. In capitalist society, commodities take on a similar aura. They appear to possess value in and of themselves, as though their worth arises from their material properties or from the act of exchange alone. But in truth, the value of every commodity is a social fact, rooted in the labor time socially necessary to produce it. It is not gold, silver, or the market that gives a commodity its value—it is the labor of countless human beings, woven together in complex networks of production.

Yet this truth is obscured. In the marketplace, commodities confront each other not as the products of human effort but as autonomous bearers of value. A loaf of bread, a coat, a smartphone—each seems to have value because it can be exchanged for money, and money seems to have value because it can be exchanged for anything. The social labor embodied in these objects disappears from view, replaced by price tags and appearances. This concealment is not accidental—it is systemic. The capitalist mode of production transforms labor into a private act performed for the market, and in doing so, it hides the collective nature of production behind the illusion of individual exchange.

Fetishism extends beyond objects. The wage relation itself becomes mystified. Workers appear to be paid fairly for their time, as if wages were the full equivalent of the labor they perform. In reality, as we have seen, wages represent only a portion of the value the worker produces. But because labor and value are separated, because production is shrouded in private contracts and competition, exploitation is disguised as fairness. The worker sees only the paycheck, not the surplus that is extracted from their effort.

This mystification spreads into all aspects of life. Property, for example, appears as a natural and neutral right, not as a historical and social relation based on exclusion and control. Capital seems to grow by its own power, money to reproduce itself, machines to create wealth. The capitalist appears as a job creator, not as the appropriator of unpaid labor. Even social roles—manager, investor, consumer—are detached from the underlying class relationships they mask. Society is structured in such a way that the real producers—the working class—are made to feel powerless, even dependent, while those who live off their labor are celebrated as innovators and leaders.

The ideological effect of commodity fetishism is to naturalize and legitimize capitalism. It presents the social world as a series of neutral transactions, a realm of individual freedom and market system, rather than a battlefield of class struggle. The economic laws of capitalism appear objective and immutable, like the laws of nature, rather than products of human relations and historical development.

Unveiling fetishism is one of the most revolutionary acts of Marxist theory. It reveals that beneath the seeming autonomy of things lies the alienated labor of human beings. It exposes the deception at the heart of the system, where the products of labor dominate their producers, and where the social world becomes an object that humans no longer control. To break the power of fetishism is not merely to see clearly—it is to act. It is to reclaim the social character of labor, to strip commodities of their illusion, and to reassert the primacy of human needs over market system.

In a socialist society, the fetishism of commodities would vanish along with the wage system and private ownership of the means of production. Production would be consciously organized by those who labor, and objects would once again appear as what they truly are: the material embodiment of collective effort, made not for profit, but for life.

Among all the commodities exchanged in a capitalist society, one stands apart in both form and consequence: labor power. This is not a finished product nor a raw material—it is the living capacity of a human being to work. And yet, under capitalism, even this most intimate human faculty is bought and sold on the market like any other good. Its transformation into a commodity is not a natural development; it is the result of a specific historical process rooted in the rise of capitalist property relations. This commodification of labor power is what makes wage labor possible and exploitation inevitable.

Labor power, Marx explains, becomes a commodity only under two key conditions. First, the worker must be free in a double sense: free to sell their labor, but also freed from any means of production of their own. They cannot be tied to the land like a serf, nor owned like a slave. At the same time, they must be dispossessed—they must have no tools, no property, no alternative means of survival. This dual condition emerges only with the destruction of older modes of life, particularly feudalism. Peasants were driven from the land, guilds dissolved, and subsistence economies dismantled. Through this process—what Marx calls “primitive accumulation”—millions were transformed into wage laborers, not by choice, but by necessity.

Once labor power appears on the market, it is treated like any other commodity. It has a price—called wages—determined by its value: the amount of socially necessary labor time required to reproduce it. This includes food, housing, clothing, and other essentials that allow the worker to return to work each day and to raise the next generation of laborers. But the act of selling labor power is unique. Unlike other commodities, labor power can only be activated through use—through the living activity of the worker. And in the process of being used, it creates more value than it costs.

This is the central paradox of capitalism: the capitalist purchases labor power at its value, but its use creates value beyond that amount. In this difference lies surplus value—the source of all profit, rent, and accumulation. The capitalist is not buying finished labor, but the right to command labor for a certain number of hours. During that time, the worker produces both the equivalent of their wage and a surplus, which is appropriated by the capitalist without payment. It is here that exploitation occurs—not in the act of exchange, which appears equal, but in the production process, where labor is consumed.

Because labor power is sold daily, workers are continually exposed to the pressures of the market. When jobs are scarce, they must accept lower wages; when technology advances, their skills are devalued; when profits decline, they are discarded. Labor power is thus commodified, but it is unlike any other commodity—it suffers, it hungers, it resists. This tension defines the class struggle within capitalism.

Furthermore, the commodification of labor power distorts human life. Work becomes something external, something done for survival, not for fulfillment. Time itself is divided into paid and unpaid hours, productive and unproductive moments, as the rhythms of life are subordinated to the demands of capital. The workplace becomes a zone of control, discipline, and surveillance. The worker is not merely selling their time—they are subjecting their mind, body, and energy to a system designed to extract the maximum output with minimal compensation.

This system also reshapes identity. Workers come to see themselves through the lens of the labor market—as skilled or unskilled, employable or redundant, successful or failing. Their value is measured not by their humanity, but by their productivity. Labor power becomes a unit of calculation, and the person behind it disappears behind the numbers.

The transformation of labor power into a commodity is thus not just an economic fact—it is a social and moral catastrophe. It reduces human potential to a line on a ledger and subordinates the worker's life to the needs of capital. Yet this process also contains its own contradiction. For in selling their labor, workers do more than sustain capitalism—they produce it. And in that position, they also gain the power to halt production, to organize, to strike, and to ultimately reclaim the labor that has been stolen from them.

To abolish the commodification of labor power is to abolish capitalism itself. It is to end a system where work is alienated and begin one where labor is freely associated, collectively organized, and directed toward human need. In a socialist society, labor power would cease to be a commodity, and with it would vanish the market that turned life into profit and profit into purpose.

At the core of capitalist society lies a fundamental inversion of justice: the very people who create all wealth own none of it. The system masks this reality with the language of contract, law, and consent, presenting wage labor as a fair exchange between free individuals. But beneath this illusion is a brutal economic truth: capitalism is legalized theft. It does not rob workers at gunpoint or steal behind their backs—it takes openly, through a system of property and law designed to protect the rights of capital against the needs of labor. Every hour worked, every product made, every profit earned begins with one inescapable fact: the worker creates value that is immediately expropriated.

The source of this theft lies in the wage relation itself. When a capitalist hires a worker, they are not paying for the value created by the labor—they are paying for the worker's ability to labor, for a limited period of time. As we have seen, the wage covers only the cost of keeping the worker alive and capable of working: food, rent, transportation, minimal comforts. Yet what the worker produces during the workday vastly exceeds this cost. The surplus is taken,

transformed into profit, and claimed as the rightful property of the capitalist. The laborer leaves with their wage, the employer with commodities or services that can be sold for far more. The exchange appears equal, but the result is profoundly unequal.

The capitalist claims ownership of the product not because they made it, but because they own the tools, the factory, the office, or the platform through which it was produced. Their contribution lies in providing the conditions of work—conditions that exist only because previous generations of workers created them. Machinery, technology, infrastructure, and raw materials all bear the marks of human labor. Even capital itself is nothing but accumulated labor, stored up in the form of property. And yet, in the capitalist system, all these elements are concentrated in private hands, while those who continue to create and sustain them are cast into dependence and dispossession.

This expropriation is not random or exceptional—it is systematic and continuous. Every moment the worker spends on the job generates value, and every moment beyond the time needed to earn their wage adds to the capitalist's surplus. This is the system of exploitation, sanctioned by contract law, enforced by the state, and normalized by ideology. The worker may be told they are lucky to have a job, that hard work leads to advancement, that the system rewards merit. But the structural reality remains: the means of production are privately owned, and therefore so too is the wealth they generate. The worker's role is to enrich someone else.

Capitalism reinforces this arrangement through legal frameworks that protect property above all else. Laws ensure that profits belong to owners, not producers. They punish theft from the employer, but never consider the daily theft from the worker. Tax codes, labor regulations, and contracts are all shaped to preserve the power of capital. Even the state itself operates as the guarantor of this order, intervening not to challenge exploitation but to manage it—regulating its most excessive forms without ever questioning its foundation.

This legalized theft extends beyond the workplace. The housing market, healthcare system, education, and even leisure are increasingly commodified, requiring workers to spend their wages—already a fraction of what they produce—just to survive. Debt replaces access, and dependency replaces freedom. The wealth workers create is turned into the very thing that oppresses them: profits are reinvested in automation that displaces them, in real estate that prices them out, in surveillance systems that discipline them, and in ideologies that blame them for their own precarity.

Yet the most dangerous aspect of this system is its normalization. Because exploitation is veiled by contracts, market exchanges, and familiar routines, it is rarely seen for what it is. The worker does not walk into the factory or office feeling robbed. But each day, they leave behind the true fruits of their labor—absorbed by a system that recognizes only ownership, not effort, as the source of wealth.

To expose capitalism as legalized theft is not a rhetorical flourish; it is a scientific description of how value is created and appropriated. It clarifies the central injustice of the system and the necessity of its overthrow. The only way to end this theft is to abolish the wage system, to

socialize the means of production, and to return the control of wealth to those who produce it. Under socialism, wealth would no longer be hoarded but shared. The worker would no longer labor to enrich another but would labor to enrich society—and, in doing so, themselves.

The Engine of Inequality – Accumulation and Alienation

The surplus value extracted from the worker does not remain idle in the hands of the capitalist. It is not spent merely on luxury or personal indulgence, though these are visible signs of capitalist wealth. Instead, surplus value is reinvested, expanded, and transformed—it becomes capital. This process, known as accumulation, is the central motor of the capitalist system. It is how wealth multiplies, how classes harden, and how inequality deepens over time. As Marx reveals in *Capital*, accumulation is not a secondary outcome of profit but the very purpose of capitalist production.

The capitalist does not aim simply to produce goods for consumption. The aim is to produce commodities that yield profit, and to use that profit to produce even more commodities—an unending cycle of expansion. Money is not exchanged for goods to satisfy needs, but for the sake of generating more money. This is the formula Marx summarized as M–C–M': money invested to produce commodities, which are then sold for more money. The key to this cycle is surplus value: the unpaid labor that allows the capitalist to end with more than they began.

Once this surplus is realized as profit, a portion is spent on personal consumption—lavish homes, private jets, and elite indulgences—but the larger share is reinvested. It is used to buy more machinery, hire more labor, expand production, and capture greater market share. This reinvested profit becomes new capital, which in turn produces new surplus value, which is again reinvested. Capital thus appears to grow out of itself, accumulating through its own momentum. But this illusion conceals the truth: at every stage, accumulation is grounded in the exploitation of labor. Without the worker, there is no surplus, and without surplus, capital withers.

This process creates a compulsion. The capitalist cannot simply choose to stop accumulating. Competition forces them to reinvest, to innovate, to cut costs, to expand—lest they be outpaced by rivals. This drive is not rooted in personal greed, though it often wears that mask, but in the structural way of the system. Accumulate or perish becomes the law of survival. The capitalist who fails to reinvest their surplus value is soon overtaken and devoured by those who do.

The result is an ever-widening gap between capital and labor. As capital accumulates, the capitalist class grows in wealth and power, while the working class remains stuck in dependency. The tools, factories, and infrastructures built by workers do not liberate them—they are used to intensify their exploitation. As investment increases, productivity rises, but wages remain stagnant or decline. Workers are made more efficient, not more secure. Their labor produces more value, yet they see less of it.

Accumulation is thus not neutral—it is the concentration of wealth by dispossession. It turns surplus value into new capital and that capital into a means of dominating labor. The more the capitalist class accumulates, the more dependent the worker becomes. What began as a transaction—a wage for work—becomes a structure of control. Through accumulation, the capitalist owns not just the present output of the worker, but increasingly their future as well.

This dynamic also reshapes society. It transforms social institutions, bending education, law, media, and government toward the interests of capital. The state becomes a manager of accumulation, ensuring favorable conditions for investment while suppressing unrest. Economic crises—periodic crashes, layoffs, and recessions—are not aberrations but consequences of the accumulation process itself. When surplus cannot be profitably reinvested, production slows, workers are discarded, and capital goes in search of new, often more brutal, frontiers of exploitation.

Through accumulation, capitalism does not simply produce goods—it produces inequality. It transforms unpaid labor into private capital, then uses that capital to deepen exploitation. The wealth of the few becomes both the result of and the means to the continued subjugation of the many. Capital grows not from efficiency, innovation, or genius, but from a system designed to turn labor into profit and profit into power.

To challenge capitalism is therefore to challenge accumulation. It is to reject the idea that wealth should endlessly expand for its own sake, and to demand that the products of labor be returned to those who create them. In a socialist system, accumulation would no longer serve private enrichment but collective development. Surplus would not become capital, but a common fund for social needs—healthcare, education, housing, art, and science. The cycle of exploitation would be broken, and the engine of inequality dismantled.

As capital accumulates, inequality becomes not only more visible but structurally entrenched. The very process of capitalist growth ensures the widening of the gap between those who own the means of production and those who must sell their labor to survive. This inequality is not a moral failure, nor a policy misstep—it is the inevitable consequence of a system where wealth multiplies for the few by intensifying exploitation of the many. The more capital expands, the more concentrated it becomes; the more wealth is created, the more it escapes the grasp of those who actually produce it.

Under capitalism, productivity increases rapidly through mechanization and technological innovation. While this might suggest an opportunity for a general improvement in living standards, the result is often the opposite. Machines replace labor, and workers are cast out of the production process in pursuit of efficiency and profit. Marx identified this contradiction clearly: technological progress under capitalism does not emancipate the worker—it displaces them. Rather than reducing the burden of labor, it reduces the number of people needed to labor at all.

The outcome is a growing mass of unemployed and underemployed workers—what Marx termed the *industrial reserve army*. This population of displaced laborers is not accidental or temporary. It is a permanent feature of the capitalist mode of production. It serves several

essential functions for the system. First, it exerts downward pressure on wages. When jobs are scarce and unemployment is high, workers are forced to accept lower pay, longer hours, and worse conditions. The fear of falling into the ranks of the unemployed disciplines the working class and undermines collective resistance.

Second, the reserve army provides a flexible labor pool for capital. When demand rises, capital can draw upon this surplus population to expand production quickly and cheaply. When demand falls, these same workers are discarded without consequence. Their precarious position becomes a tool of control. They are exploited when needed and forgotten when not, shuffled between temporary work, gig labor, and enforced idleness.

This reserve army is not confined to any one nation. It is reproduced on a global scale. As capitalism spreads through imperialism, free trade, and the global supply chain, workers in formerly colonized or economically dependent regions are drawn into the world labor market under the same conditions of dispossession and superexploitation. Here, the reserve army takes its most brutal form: child laborers in mines, sweatshop workers in garment factories, and migrant laborers with no rights. Capital always seeks out the cheapest, most vulnerable labor and produces inequality wherever it takes root.

At the same time, inequality sharpens within capitalist societies. As profits are reinvested, the owners of capital gain not only more wealth but more power—economic, political, and ideological. They buy influence, dictate policy, and shape the institutions that sustain their dominance. Meanwhile, the worker, even when employed, remains on the edge of precarity. Wages stagnate, benefits disappear, and the cost of living rises. Debt becomes the means through which workers are kept afloat—and further bound to the system that exploits them.

The industrial reserve army grows not only in times of crisis, but also during apparent prosperity. For every new technology and business model that emerges, there are workers displaced, marginalized, and left behind. The wealth generated by innovation never trickles down—it consolidates. As the ruling class multiplies its fortunes, the working class finds itself fighting merely to stand still. The poor are blamed for their poverty, the jobless for their unemployment, and the homeless for their despair—all while capital extracts more from their suffering.

Marx understood this process as a law of motion. Capitalism does not simply produce inequality—it reproduces and deepens it through the very mechanisms that define its success. The accumulation of capital and the production of surplus labor go hand in hand. The existence of a surplus population is not an unfortunate externality—it is internal to the system's way.

To break this cycle, the foundation must be destroyed. In a socialist society, the means of production would be held collectively. Work would be organized not to generate profit but to meet social needs. The reserve army would vanish—not because all would be forced into labor, but because labor would be shared, dignified, and decoupled from the desperate need to survive. Employment would not be a punishment, and unemployment would not be a death

sentence. Instead, the resources of society would be mobilized to provide security, freedom, and equality for all—not accumulation for the few.

Under capitalism, labor is not simply a means of survival—it is a condition of alienation. The worker does not merely exchange time for wages, but in doing so, surrenders their creative power, their autonomy, and ultimately their very humanity. Marx described this process as *alienation*, a profound estrangement between the worker and the world they help to build. It is not just that labor is exploited; it is that labor becomes foreign, oppressive, and empty of meaning. In the act of working, the worker is separated from the product, the process, their fellow workers, and even their own inner life.

In earlier forms of society, though hardship and hierarchy were often present, labor still retained some link to the individual. The peasant knew the land they tilled; the artisan shaped tools or crafted goods with care, often from start to finish. But in the capitalist system, the worker becomes a mere appendage of the machine. Production is broken down into lifeless, repetitive tasks. Labor is atomized, fragmented, and subordinated to the rhythm of profit. The more advanced the factory, the more mechanical the labor becomes—and the less the worker sees themselves in what they create.

The first form of alienation arises between the worker and the product of labor. Whatever the worker makes—whether a garment, a car, a meal, or a software code—belongs not to them, but to the capitalist. The object is taken away, sold for profit, and used in ways the worker cannot control. Their labor is objectified in a product that is not theirs, that may even return to them in the form of something unaffordable. This is a theft more intimate than wage exploitation—it is the theft of creative expression. The worker's activity, which should be an extension of their will, becomes a source of estrangement.

Second, the worker is alienated from the act of production itself. Work becomes external, not chosen but imposed. It is something done not for pleasure or fulfillment, but to earn a wage—to survive. The laborer does not feel at home in the act of labor; rather, they feel most alive only when not working. As Marx wrote, in work, the worker feels outside themselves, and outside work, they feel truly themselves—but only as a biological being, eating, sleeping, existing. The job is not a space of self-realization but of self-denial.

Third, the worker is alienated from others. In capitalist society, work is not cooperative in any genuine sense. Though many labor together in the same space, they do not control their activity or its purpose. They are pitted against one another in competition for jobs, wages, promotions. Solidarity is discouraged, individuality is hollowed out, and other workers are seen less as comrades than as threats. The social character of labor—its inherently collective nature—is hidden beneath the surface of competition and hierarchy.

Finally, and most devastatingly, the worker is alienated from their own species-being—from the essence of what it means to be human. Humans are naturally creative, social beings. Labor, at its best, is an expression of thought, imagination, and care. Under capitalism, this capacity is deformed. Instead of shaping the world consciously and freely, the worker is shaped by the demands of capital. Their energy is consumed, not to build a better world, but

to sustain a system that exploits and discards them. The human becomes a tool of profit, their potential reduced to efficiency and obedience.

Alienation is not a feeling—it is a condition, embedded in the very structure of capitalist production. It explains the pervasive sense of powerlessness, isolation, and dissatisfaction that haunts even those who are materially secure. It reveals why work, for so many, is not a source of dignity but of despair. Even outside the workplace, the effects of alienation persist—in consumerism, in hollow entertainment, in the loss of community and purpose.

To overcome alienation requires more than reforms or better conditions—it requires a complete transformation of how labor is organized and why it is done. In a socialist society, labor would no longer be a commodity but a conscious social activity. Production would be guided not by profit but by human need. The worker would no longer be a stranger to their work, to others, or to themselves. They would see their own reflection in the world they help to shape, reclaiming labor as a path to fulfillment rather than a mark of oppression.

Only by ending the domination of capital over labor can humanity recover its essence—its capacity to act, to create, and to live in genuine freedom. Alienation, born of exploitation, will be abolished only when the system that produces it is left behind.

The structure of the working day under capitalism is not shaped by the rhythm of nature or the needs of the worker—it is defined by the hunger for surplus value. From the moment labor power became a commodity, capital has sought to extend and intensify the working day to its absolute limits. The longer a worker labors beyond the time needed to reproduce their wage, the more surplus value is generated. Thus, the working day becomes a battleground, not over hours alone, but over life itself—over how much of the worker's existence can be consumed by capital.

In *Capital*, Marx shows that the struggle to limit the working day was among the first and most essential conflicts between workers and capitalists. Left to its own devices, capital knows no bounds. It would seize the whole day, if possible. Early industrial capitalism subjected men, women, and children to brutal shifts of twelve, fourteen, even sixteen hours in miserable conditions. The factory did not pause for exhaustion, sickness, or the need for rest—it ran according to the demands of profit. Human beings were treated as extensions of the machine, valued only for their ability to keep pace with it.

This unrelenting exploitation necessitated the intervention of law. It was only after years of agitation, strikes, and sacrifice that laws limiting the working day were won. But even these protections have never been secure. Capital finds ways to bypass them—through temporary contracts, unpaid overtime, gig labor, or offshoring production to places where labor laws are weak or nonexistent. The fight over the length and intensity of the working day remains as relevant today as in the earliest days of industrialism.

The factory system itself is central to the dehumanization of labor. It represents the organization of production not around the skills or autonomy of the worker, but around the system of machines and the control of capital. In the factory, the pace of work is set

externally, by mechanical motion and managerial oversight. The worker does not control the process—they are subordinated to it. Tasks are divided into narrow, repetitive motions, leaving no room for thought, creativity, or variation. The result is not only physical fatigue but mental and emotional numbness.

This transformation of labor into mechanical repetition reduces the worker to a living tool. No longer do they direct their labor toward a whole product or meaningful goal. Instead, they perform isolated functions, disconnected from the purpose or result of their activity. The factory is not a site of cooperation, but of fragmentation. Workers are positioned beside one another but are separated by task, by rank, and by the constant pressure to keep pace.

This system of labor discipline is enforced not only through machines, but through architecture, timekeeping, and surveillance. Clocks, bells, supervisors, and schedules all serve to regiment life around production. The worker's body is measured and managed: breaks are rationed, bathroom use scrutinized, even speech controlled. Time itself is colonized by capital, broken into units to be sold and consumed.

This system has not disappeared—it has only evolved. The modern office, warehouse, and delivery platform apply the same principles through new technologies. Algorithms now dictate schedules; productivity is tracked in real-time; flexibility becomes a new form of insecurity. The worker is monitored, evaluated, and optimized—always under the threat of replacement.

But perhaps the most devastating aspect of the working day is what it steals from life. When labor dominates every hour, little is left for rest, thought, care, or joy. The worker returns home not to freedom, but to recovery. Time off is not leisure but preparation for the next shift. Entire lives are consumed in this cycle, leaving individuals exhausted and communities fractured. The development of productive forces, which should allow for a shorter working day and a richer human life, is instead used to squeeze more from each worker while discarding the rest.

Marx saw clearly that the reduction of the working day was not a mere reform—it was a condition of liberation. Only when labor ceases to dominate life can humanity begin to live fully. Under socialism, the working day would be consciously limited, not extended. Labor would be distributed, not hoarded. Time would no longer be measured by profit, but by purpose. The goal is not to abolish work, but to abolish its domination—to reclaim time for life, for thought, for relationships, and for freedom.

In this struggle over time and labor, the working class does not merely demand fewer hours—they demand to be treated as human. And in doing so, they strike at the heart of a system that treats life as a means to profit, rather than an end in itself.

The dynamics of capitalist society are not random or chaotic in the sense of pure disorder; they operate according to underlying laws of motion—systematic, relentless mechanisms that govern the behavior of capital and labor alike. But these laws do not produce balance, equity, or stability. On the contrary, they generate ever-deepening social crisis. They produce growth

without security, technological advancement without liberation, and abundance alongside deprivation. The capitalist system, driven by its own internal system, expands production while undermining the very social foundations it requires to survive.

Marx uncovered these laws by analyzing capitalism not as a collection of market phenomena, but as a mode of production—a social system structured by class antagonism and the pursuit of surplus value. One of the fundamental laws is the compulsion to accumulate capital. Every capitalist enterprise must reinvest surplus value to remain competitive. This imperative leads to a constant revolutionizing of the means of production, a permanent drive to expand markets, and an unending search for cheaper labor, raw materials, and technologies.

However, this expansion is inherently unstable. Capitalism is driven by the pursuit of profit, not by the satisfaction of human needs. As a result, it often produces more than can be sold. Workers are paid less than the value they produce, meaning they cannot buy back the commodities they help create. This contradiction leads to overproduction, glutted markets, falling prices, and eventually economic crises. These crises are not external shocks but natural outcomes of the system's internal laws. They appear periodically—recessions, depressions, collapses—each destroying capital, displacing workers, and deepening misery while clearing the way for renewed accumulation.

Another central law is the tendency of the rate of profit to fall. As capitalists invest more in machinery and technology to boost productivity and reduce labor costs, the proportion of investment going into human labor—which alone creates value—diminishes. While output rises, profit margins tend to shrink. To counter this, capitalists intensify exploitation, seek out new markets, cut wages, or eliminate jobs. But none of these measures can reverse the tendency permanently. The system enters into a desperate race against itself, constantly revolutionizing production while undermining the source of its own profitability: labor.

This drive for profit also reshapes every aspect of society. Education becomes job training, healthcare becomes a commodity, housing becomes an investment. Public goods are privatized, social protections eroded, and every need turned into a market. Communities are gutted, ecologies devastated, and lives disrupted in the name of efficiency and growth. Alienation spreads not only through the workplace, but through culture, politics, and everyday life. Social bonds weaken, mental illness rises, and discontent simmers.

Meanwhile, the working class faces mounting pressure. Job insecurity becomes the norm. Debt replaces income as the main way to access housing, education, and even basic survival. The social safety net is slashed, and the cost of living rises. Workers are told to work more, harder, longer, for less—and to blame themselves when they cannot keep up. Those who resist are punished; those who conform are exhausted. The result is a society in which production has reached unprecedented heights, yet misery persists and grows.

Inequality, far from being an accidental outcome, is a direct expression of capitalism's laws of motion. As capital accumulates, it concentrates. A handful of individuals and corporations come to control vast resources, while the majority sink deeper into precarity. Political power follows economic power, and democracy is hollowed out. The state, rather than acting as a

neutral arbiter, serves to stabilize and enforce the conditions for accumulation—through policy, surveillance, repression, and war.

In the global sphere, these laws extend their reach. Imperialism, environmental destruction, forced migration, and global debt crises all stem from the same dynamics. Resources are extracted, labor exploited, and entire populations displaced to sustain the accumulation process. The drive for capital knows no boundary, no rest, and no end. It burns through nature, humanity, and even its own stability in pursuit of surplus.

Thus, the laws of motion of capitalism are not neutral principles—they are the forces that structure the crises of our time. They ensure that social antagonism deepens as the system expands, that every gain is met with renewed struggle, and that the possibility of reform is constrained by the demands of profit.

Marx did not reveal these laws to predict doom, but to illuminate the path to emancipation. By understanding the system of capital, the working class can organize not around surface reforms but around a revolutionary break. To end the crises, we must end the system that generates them. In place of accumulation, cooperation. In place of profit, need. In place of competition, solidarity.

The crises of capitalism are not just signs of its dysfunction—they are signals of its historical limit. The choice, as Marx and Engels warned, is not between this system and another version of it. The choice is between socialism and barbarism.

The Bourgeois Ideology – Illusions, Power, and False Freedom

In every epoch of human history, the ideas that dominate society do not emerge from the masses, nor do they represent the common interest of all people. They are, as Marx and Engels assert in *The German Ideology*, the ruling ideas of the ruling class. This principle lies at the heart of historical materialism: the content of ideology is not shaped by abstract reason, divine will, or neutral debate, but by the material structure of society—by who owns, who controls, and who benefits. In a society divided by class, thought is never free from power. The dominant ideology serves as the intellectual expression of material domination.

Under capitalism, this principle manifests with striking clarity. The bourgeoisie, having seized control of the means of production, also seize control of the means of mental production. They do not rule only through economics or law—they rule through ideas. The press, the schools, the universities, the arts, the culture industry, the discourse of science and morality—all are shaped by and for the interests of capital. Ideology becomes not a mirror of truth but a distortion that justifies and secures bourgeois power.

These ruling ideas take many forms. The sanctity of private property, the virtue of competition, the belief in meritocracy, the illusion of free markets, the glorification of individualism, the notion that poverty results from laziness—all are designed to naturalize the current social order. These concepts appear universal, timeless, even moral, but they are

historically produced to maintain the status quo. In reality, they mask the structures of exploitation and prevent the working class from seeing the system for what it is.

The bourgeoisie does not need to impose these ideas by force alone. Rather, it creates a world in which these ideas seem self-evident. The worker, trapped in the daily struggle to survive, is bombarded by messages that reinforce their place in the hierarchy. Success stories glorify those who "made it" from humble origins, obscuring the millions who labor without reward. Media celebrate consumerism, productivity, and corporate success while erasing exploitation, dispossession, and alienation. The conditions of life under capitalism themselves generate beliefs that reinforce it.

In *The Communist Manifesto*, Marx and Engels describe how the bourgeoisie universalized its ideology, presenting its own interests as the interests of all. The market is depicted not as a historical construct, but as human nature. The capitalist is cast as a visionary builder of progress. Wage labor is called freedom, though it is born of necessity. Exploitation is hidden beneath the language of opportunity. The whole system of class power is rebranded as a neutral mechanism of supply and demand.

Religion, morality, law, and philosophy are all drawn into this ideological machinery. Religion offers the poor the hope of redemption in the next life, while demanding obedience in this one. Morality praises hard work and thrift as virtues, masking the theft of surplus labor. Law claims equality before its statutes, even as it enforces unequal property relations. Philosophy upholds liberal notions of freedom and reason, but not within the framework of private ownership and individualism. Each of these disciplines, shaped within the structure of class society, reflects and defends the interests of its masters.

Even education, which promises enlightenment, functions as a transmission belt for ruling ideas. Schools teach discipline, punctuality, obedience to authority, and the myth of social mobility. Universities produce intellectuals who, wittingly or not, reinforce the dominant ideology through economic theory, historical narrative, and political science. The appearance of freedom in thought conceals the reality of conformity in content.

The ruling class does not merely dominate through coercion—it dominates through consent. This consent is manufactured not by lies alone but by the shaping of the very categories through which people interpret their world. The concept of "common sense" is formed within this ideological fog. Workers may oppose injustice, yet continue to believe in the system that causes it. This is the power of ideology—not to convince with logic, but to limit imagination, to define the possible, to make rebellion appear irrational and socialism seem impossible.

Yet ideology is not unbreakable. Its foundations rest on material conditions that can change. When workers begin to organize, strike, and analyze their conditions collectively, the ruling ideas begin to lose their grip. In the heat of struggle, class consciousness emerges, and with it the ability to think beyond the categories imposed by the ruling class. To challenge ideology is to awaken not only resistance but clarity—the clarity to see that the ideas that dominate us are not truths, but tools of domination.

The battle against capitalism is also a battle of ideas. But socialist ideas do not emerge from theory alone—they arise from the material interest and lived experience of the proletariat. When the working class sees through the illusion and grasps the truth of its position, the ruling ideas begin to tremble. And with them, the rule of capital.

Capitalist society proudly proclaims itself the guardian of individual freedom. The freedom to choose one's profession, to move from one job to another, to buy and sell on the open market, to own property and sign contracts—these are held up as signs of liberation from the chains of feudalism and tyranny. The worker, we are told, is free to accept or reject employment, to negotiate wages, and to build a life through effort and ambition. But this freedom, under capitalism, is an illusion—a legal fiction masking economic compulsion and class domination. The worker is free only in the sense that they are free to starve.

What appears as free wage labor is, in fact, a condition of dependency. The laborer does not sell a product they own, but their capacity to labor—their time, their energy, their life. This capacity must be sold, or the worker cannot eat, cannot find shelter, cannot live. It is not a voluntary exchange, but a coerced necessity. The capitalist, by contrast, is free in a different sense: free from the need to work, free to choose whether to invest or speculate, to exploit labor or idle in luxury. This asymmetry reveals the hollowness of bourgeois liberty. The worker is formally equal before the law, but materially unequal in every moment of life.

Wage labor is the form that conceals exploitation. It creates the illusion of an even trade: labor for money, effort for reward. But as Marx showed, the wage is not the value of what the worker produces—it is only what is needed to maintain the worker's ability to keep working. The rest of the value, created through unpaid labor time, is appropriated by the capitalist as profit. Yet because the worker enters into this exchange "freely," the theft remains hidden beneath a contract. Exploitation is legalized, institutionalized, and masked by the very language of liberty.

The conditions that make this exchange possible are themselves products of violence and dispossession. The working class did not arise through natural evolution, but through the forcible separation of people from land, tools, and autonomous forms of livelihood. This process, described by Marx as "primitive accumulation," created the class of people with nothing to sell but their labor power. Having been stripped of other means of survival, they became bound to the market, where their freedom consists in choosing which master to serve.

This illusion is reinforced ideologically. Workers are taught to see themselves as free agents, responsible for their own success or failure. If wages are low, they are told to acquire new skills; if they lose their job, they must work harder to be competitive. Structural conditions are reframed as personal shortcomings. In this way, the system escapes blame, while workers internalize their own exploitation. The ideology of choice becomes a mechanism of control.

The culture of capitalism celebrates this illusion. Media portray work not as compulsion but as empowerment. Success stories focus on the few who escape the working class through luck or conformity, while ignoring the systemic conditions that hold millions in place. Freedom becomes synonymous with consumer choice—the ability to buy different brands,

not the ability to control one's life. Politics narrows to the vote, stripped of class content, offering only the freedom to choose between different managers of the same system.

But real freedom is not the absence of feudal bonds, nor the formal equality of contract law. Real freedom means the ability to control one's time, to shape one's labor, to participate meaningfully in social life. Under capitalism, none of this is possible for the working class. Their time is sold, their labor alienated, and their social role confined to the reproduction of capital. They are free in form but bound in substance.

Socialism offers a different kind of freedom. It begins by abolishing wage labor as the dominant form of human activity. When the means of production are held in common, labor can be organized not for profit but for need. Work can become a voluntary, creative, and collective process—an expression of human potential rather than a means of survival. Time can be reclaimed for education, art, rest, and participation in communal life. Freedom, in this sense, is no longer an illusion but a material reality.

The illusion of freedom under capitalism is powerful because it appears in the language of rights and choice. But behind every "right" granted to the worker stands the reality of class power. Only when this power is overthrown can freedom become more than a word—only then can it become life itself, fully lived and collectively determined.

In bourgeois society, the state is portrayed as a neutral arbiter, an impartial guardian of law and order, standing above the classes and resolving conflicts in the name of the general interest. It appears as a universal institution—one that represents all citizens equally and defends liberty, justice, and democracy. But Marx and Engels, through rigorous historical analysis, exposed this vision as a deliberate illusion. In reality, the state is not a neutral body. It is the concentrated force of class power, a weapon in the hands of the ruling class, and under capitalism, that class is the bourgeoisie.

In *The Communist Manifesto*, Marx and Engels state plainly: "The executive of the modern state is but a committee for managing the common affairs of the whole bourgeoisie." This is not a metaphor. The state, with its laws, police, courts, military, and bureaucracies, is constructed to maintain the conditions necessary for the exploitation of labor and the accumulation of capital. It protects private property not as a universal right, but as a class privilege. It enforces contracts not to ensure fairness, but to guarantee that the extraction of surplus value proceeds without disruption.

The state did not emerge from a social contract or a mutual agreement among equals. It was born out of the irreconcilable antagonism between classes. As society became divided between exploiters and exploited—slaveholders and slaves, lords and serfs, capitalists and workers—a force was needed to suppress the resistance of the oppressed. The state arose as that force, cloaked in legitimacy, but rooted in violence. Its true function has always been to safeguard the rule of the dominant class, to prevent rebellion, and to stabilize inequality.

In capitalist societies, the institutions of democracy are permitted only insofar as they do not threaten the foundations of private property and capital. Parliaments, elections, and

constitutions exist, but they are shaped and constrained by the economic realities of class power. Political parties are funded by capital, media is owned by capital, and policies are designed to serve capital. When these mechanisms fail to protect bourgeois interests, the state does not hesitate to reveal its coercive nature. Strikes are crushed, protests are surveilled, and laws are rewritten to serve the needs of business. Beneath every democratic form lies the threat of force.

This class character of the state becomes especially visible in times of crisis. When the accumulation of capital is threatened—whether by economic collapse, labor unrest, or revolutionary activity—the state acts swiftly to rescue the system. Banks are bailed out, corporations are protected, austerity is imposed, and the working class is made to bear the cost. Reforms may be offered to calm unrest, but they are rolled back when the threat passes. The state's role is not to correct the injustices of capitalism—it is to ensure their continuation.

Even the functions of the state that appear social—public education, healthcare, infrastructure—are ultimately subordinated to capitalist system. They exist not to guarantee universal dignity, but to maintain a productive and disciplined labor force. The moment they threaten profits, they are privatized or dismantled. The state educates workers just enough to be employable, heals them just enough to be exploitable, and houses them just enough to prevent rebellion. Social services under capitalism are always conditional, always fragile, always shaped by the needs of capital.

This is not to say that the state is omnipotent or unchanging. The working class can and does win victories through struggle. Labor laws, voting rights, civil protections—these are all the products of organized resistance. But such gains are never secure within a capitalist state. They are concessions, not transformations. And they are always under threat from the same class that the state ultimately serves.

True liberation cannot be achieved by seizing the existing state and repurposing it for the working class. The bourgeois state, with its structure and purpose, is unfit for emancipation. It must be dismantled and replaced by a new form of political organization—a workers' state, built on radically democratic principles, grounded in the self-organization of the proletariat, and directed not toward the preservation of class rule but toward its abolition.

Only in such a society—where power is exercised collectively, where decisions are made by those who labor, and where the state is a temporary means to a classless end—can the instruments of coercion be dissolved. The goal of socialism is not to perfect the bourgeois state, but to render the state itself unnecessary, to arrive at a world where the free development of each is the condition for the free development of all.

Liberalism, with its promises of individual liberty, equal rights, and representative democracy, has long presented itself as the ideological pinnacle of political freedom. It declares that each person has the right to life, liberty, property, and participation in the governance of society. These principles, enshrined in constitutions and celebrated in classrooms, have become the dominant moral language of capitalist societies. But as Marx and Engels made clear, the liberal order is not the neutral ground of freedom it claims to be. It

is a framework constructed within, and in service of, a bourgeois class structure—one that grants rights only insofar as they do not threaten the rule of capital.

At its core, liberalism conceives of society as a collection of isolated individuals, each entering into voluntary contracts in pursuit of their own interests. This atomistic vision masks the reality of class society. It portrays the worker and the capitalist as juridically equal—both possess legal rights, both are free to negotiate terms, both are protected by the same laws. Yet this formal equality exists within a material inequality so vast that the legal structure becomes a veil for domination. The worker is "free" to sell their labor power, just as the capitalist is "free" to purchase it. But only one of them depends on this transaction to survive.

Democracy, in the liberal tradition, is reduced to procedures—periodic elections, party competition, legal protections. It offers the appearance of popular rule while leaving the foundations of economic power untouched. The great decisions about production, investment, employment, and distribution are not made democratically—they are made in corporate boardrooms and financial institutions, far removed from public oversight. Liberal democracy gives the people a vote, but not control over their material conditions. The right to vote cannot cancel out the right of capital to own and exploit.

When the working class uses democratic forms to challenge bourgeois interests, the limits of liberalism are quickly exposed. Strikes are outlawed, protests are suppressed, political movements are demonized or criminalized. Legal rights are suspended in the name of order. In moments of crisis, even the thin layer of representative governance may be peeled back, revealing the dictatorship of capital beneath. Historical experience—from the Paris Commune to Chile in 1973—shows that when democracy threatens the ownership of capital, it is capital that is defended, not democracy.

Rights within the liberal order are always conditional. The right to free speech does not extend to threatening the power of employers. The right to property protects the capitalist's factory but not the worker’s job. The right to a fair trial does not shield the poor from incarceration, nor the racialized from systemic violence. Even the rights that appear progressive—such as access to education or healthcare—are constantly under siege, eroded by austerity, privatization, and market system. These rights are not guaranteed—they are tolerated only so long as they do not interfere with profit.

Moreover, liberalism treats political rights as disconnected from economic conditions. It proclaims the right to freedom while ignoring whether one has the material means to exercise it. A worker who cannot afford healthcare, who is burdened by debt, who faces eviction, is legally free—but their freedom is hollow. A right that cannot be realized in practice is no right at all. Socialism, by contrast, insists that genuine liberty must be rooted in material security. Freedom is not abstract—it is the capacity to live fully, to act without coercion, to shape one’s world.

Liberalism also mystifies the nature of the state. It presents government as the collective expression of the people, obscuring the fact that the machinery of state remains structured around the protection of capitalist relations. Even in the most advanced liberal democracies,

the state intervenes to protect private ownership, regulate labor, suppress unrest, and manage crises in ways that serve capital. It does not exist outside of class—it is an instrument of it.

None of this means that democratic rights are meaningless. They are often hard-won achievements of working-class struggle and serve as vital tools in the fight for socialism. But their permanence cannot be taken for granted. Within capitalism, even the most basic freedoms remain vulnerable. They can be revoked, restricted, or redefined as soon as they become threats to ruling class interests.

Socialism does not reject democracy—it demands its radical extension. It calls for the democratization of the economy, of production, of everyday life. It insists that rights must be universal, substantive, and protected by collective ownership and social power. Under socialism, democracy would cease to be a hollow form and become a living force. The people would not merely choose their rulers—they would rule. Rights would not depend on wealth—they would be guaranteed by society itself.

In stripping away the illusions of liberalism, Marxism does not seek to diminish the value of freedom—it seeks to make it real. Not the freedom of the few to accumulate without limit, but the freedom of all to live without domination.

The defining feature of capitalism is private property in the means of production—not the personal possession of homes, clothing, or objects of daily life, but the ownership of factories, land, tools, infrastructure, and technology that make large-scale production possible. This form of property enables one class—the bourgeoisie—to control the labor of others, to direct the production of wealth, and to appropriate its fruits. It is the foundation of exploitation, inequality, and alienation. And it is the greatest obstacle to the full realization of human freedom and potential. As Marx and Engels made clear, so long as the means of life are privately owned, the majority of people will be compelled to sell their labor under conditions not of their choosing, and humanity as a whole will remain divided, distorted, and deformed by class rule.

Private property under capitalism is not a neutral institution—it is the legalized power to exclude, to command, and to accumulate. It allows a small minority to claim as theirs the social wealth produced by millions. It transforms human creativity into a commodity, human needs into markets, and human relationships into economic transactions. The few who own capital do not merely earn income—they dictate what is produced, how it is produced, and for whom. The rest are reduced to tools of that process, their choices narrowed to submission or starvation.

Because private property concentrates decision-making power in the hands of capitalists, it necessarily restricts the democratic capacity of society. It turns what should be collective concerns—such as energy, housing, food, healthcare, transportation, and technology—into private ventures driven by profit. What is not profitable is neglected; what is essential becomes expensive. Entire sectors of life—education, care work, art, science—are distorted or destroyed by the need to generate returns. In this system, even the most brilliant minds

may be wasted, shackled to meaningless work or denied opportunities altogether, while resources are poured into vanity, luxury, and destruction.

This property regime also imposes artificial scarcity. In a world capable of producing abundance, people go hungry, remain homeless, and suffer without basic care—not because there is not enough, but because access is determined by purchasing power. Labor-saving technologies are used not to free time for all, but to concentrate wealth and eliminate jobs. Human potential—with all its diversity, imagination, and vitality—is subordinated to the profit motive, reduced to its market value, and discarded when it no longer serves capital's needs.

Alienation, so deeply embedded in capitalist life, flows directly from private property. The worker is estranged from their labor, from the products they create, from other workers, and from themselves. They cannot direct their own creative energy or engage in labor that is meaningful, communal, or expressive. Their time is sold to produce wealth they do not own, and the better they perform, the more they empower the class that exploits them. The very act of working, which should be an expression of human life, becomes a source of suffering and subjugation.

To liberate human potential requires more than reforming markets, regulating corporations, or redistributing income. It requires the abolition of the private ownership of the means of production. This is not theft—it is the restoration of collective power over what has always been the product of collective labor. It means replacing private capital with social property, managed democratically by the people who work, consume, and live within society. It means ending the exploitation of labor and directing production toward human need rather than private gain.

In a socialist society, where the means of production are held in common, work would no longer be coerced by necessity or driven by profit. It would be a conscious, collective activity aimed at enriching life. Education would not be a means to a job, but a path to growth. Art would not depend on patronage, but flourish through community support. Science would not be bent toward military or commercial aims, but toward discovery and shared progress. Time would be reclaimed, and individuals would be free to develop their capacities in cooperation with others.

Only when private property is abolished can the false separations between producer and product, worker and owner, thought and action be overcome. Only then can society harness its full intelligence, skill, and creativity—not to enrich a few, but to emancipate all. Human beings are not naturally greedy, lazy, or competitive. They are made so by a system that compels them to fight for survival in a world they do not control.

Marx and Engels envisioned a world in which the free development of each is the condition for the free development of all. Such a world is impossible so long as private property dominates. Its abolition is not merely an economic demand—it is a moral, social, and existential necessity. In overthrowing the rule of property, humanity will, for the first time,

begin to shape its own destiny. Not as classes, not as owners and workers, but as a free association of equals, creating a world worthy of human potential.

Scientific Socialism – Marx and Engels' Theory of Revolutionary Change

Before Marx and Engels forged the theoretical foundations of modern communism, socialism existed largely in the form of what they termed *utopian socialism*. Early socialist thinkers such as Charles Fourier, Robert Owen, and Henri de Saint-Simon were driven by a genuine desire to overcome the horrors of capitalist society. They imagined peaceful, ideal communities based on cooperation, equality, and harmony—models intended to inspire moral awakening rather than to incite class struggle. While their visions were humane and often insightful, Marx and Engels recognized that these utopians lacked a concrete understanding of the historical and material forces that shape society. Their socialism, however sincere, was unanchored from the dynamics of class and incapable of explaining the real path to emancipation.

The decisive breakthrough made by Marx and Engels was the transformation of socialism from a hopeful aspiration into a scientific analysis of society's development. This transformation did not mean rejecting the moral critique of capitalism, but grounding that critique in a rigorous understanding of history, economics, and class struggle. In *The German Ideology* and *Socialism: Utopian and Scientific*, they laid out the principles of what became known as *scientific socialism*. It is a method, not merely a goal—a means of understanding how human societies evolve through material contradictions and how the working class can become the conscious agent of revolutionary change.

Marx and Engels began with the premise that human history is the history of class struggle. They rejected the notion that history was the unfolding of abstract ideas or guided by divine providence. Instead, they focused on the real, practical activity of human beings as they interact with nature to produce their means of life. This materialist conception of history revealed that the organization of society—its institutions, laws, beliefs, and politics—is rooted in the mode of production. As technology and productive forces develop, they eventually come into conflict with the existing relations of production, giving rise to social revolutions.

Where utopian socialists imagined social change as the result of enlightened planning or ethical persuasion, Marx and Engels understood revolution as the product of these deep, structural contradictions. The development of capitalism, they argued, would inevitably lead to its own negation. It would create a class—the proletariat—whose conditions of life would drive it to resist exploitation, to organize collectively, and to abolish the system that enslaved it. The working class, by virtue of its position in the production process, held the unique capacity to overthrow capitalism and reorganize society on a socialist basis.

Scientific socialism is therefore not a dream of what could be, but a study of what must be. It identifies socialism not as an abstract moral ideal but as the necessary outcome of capitalism's internal dynamics. Engels emphasized in *Socialism: Utopian and Scientific* that socialism is not "the invention of clever men," but "the product of a great historical movement." The growing antagonism between capital and labor, the concentration of wealth, the impoverishment of the masses, the crises of overproduction—all these are not symptoms to be reformed, but signals of a system reaching its historical limit.

Marx and Engels also rejected the passive optimism of the utopians, who hoped that the ruling class might voluntarily adopt their blueprints. Scientific socialism recognized that no ruling class surrenders its power willingly. The transition to socialism requires class struggle—organized, conscious, and revolutionary. It requires not only economic analysis but political action, the building of a movement rooted in the real conditions and experiences of the working class.

In developing scientific socialism, Marx and Engels did more than provide a critique—they offered a method. This method combines theory and practice, critique and engagement, analysis and agitation. It is a guide to action, not a dogma. It grows through struggle, through study, and through the collective experience of workers in motion.

The shift from utopian to scientific socialism marked a turning point in the history of revolutionary thought. It gave the working class a theory grounded in their own conditions, a vision of liberation not built on fantasy, but on necessity. It armed them with the understanding that capitalism was not eternal, that its contradictions would intensify, and that their liberation was both possible and historically required.

By rooting socialism in the material development of society and the dynamics of class struggle, Marx and Engels gave the movement its compass and direction. From this foundation, the revolutionary project could proceed—not as a dream, but as a science; not as an appeal to the conscience of the ruling class, but as the collective awakening of the oppressed to their own power.

At the heart of Marx and Engels' scientific socialism lies a revolutionary method of analysis: historical materialism. This approach does not merely offer a theory of history—it provides a powerful tool for understanding how societies develop, why they change, and what forces determine the trajectory of human progress. It is not a philosophy in the abstract sense, but a method rooted in the real, practical life of human beings. Historical materialism reveals that the foundation of all social life is the way in which people produce and reproduce their material existence.

Human beings, unlike other animals, do not merely adapt to nature; they transform it through labor. They build tools, grow food, extract resources, construct homes, and shape environments to meet their needs. This process of production lies at the base of every society. But how this production is organized—who owns the tools, who performs the labor, how resources are distributed—determines the structure of social relations. These economic

foundations give rise to political institutions, laws, religions, philosophies, and cultures. In short, the material base of society shapes its ideological and institutional superstructure.

Marx and Engels emphasized that history is not driven by ideas, great individuals, or divine will. It is driven by the contradictions that arise within and between modes of production. As productive forces—technology, labor skills, scientific knowledge—develop, they eventually come into conflict with the existing relations of production—property ownership, class structures, and forms of control. These contradictions produce crises, which cannot be resolved within the old order. They force transformation, often through struggle and upheaval, as new classes rise and challenge the existing system.

This historical method makes clear that no social system is eternal. Just as feudalism was replaced by capitalism through the bourgeois revolutions of the early modern era, so too must capitalism give way to a higher form of social organization. Marx and Engels argued that the rise of capitalism created the very conditions for its own overthrow. The working class, brought together in factories and cities, subjected to the same conditions, and stripped of property, has both the interest and the power to challenge capitalist exploitation. The contradiction between capital and labor is not static—it intensifies with every cycle of accumulation, every economic crisis, every act of resistance.

Historical materialism also dismantles the myth of neutrality in dominant ideologies. It shows that the ruling ideas of any epoch are the ideas of the ruling class—not because they are truer or more rational, but because they are supported by the material interests and institutions of that class. Religion, morality, law, and philosophy do not float above society—they are shaped by its economic foundations. Understanding these ideological structures means tracing them back to their material roots.

More than a lens for interpretation, historical materialism is a guide for action. It tells us not just how the world is, but how it can be changed. It reveals that human society is made by human hands—and therefore, it can be remade. In rejecting the fatalism of passive observation and the fantasy of utopian dreaming, historical materialism arms the working class with the knowledge that their liberation must be achieved by their own efforts, in accordance with the real conditions of struggle.

It also dispels the illusion of spontaneity in social change. Revolutions do not erupt simply from moral outrage or mass emotion. They emerge from contradictions that are deep, objective, and material. But this does not mean they are automatic. The proletariat must become conscious of its position, organize collectively, and act politically. Historical materialism reveals the terrain of battle, but it is through revolutionary practice that the oppressed transform it.

Marx and Engels' method is dynamic. It refuses to treat categories like "state," "property," "freedom," or "justice" as eternal truths. Instead, it situates them within the unfolding development of human society. It examines how they have meant different things in different contexts, how they serve particular class interests, and how they can be reshaped in the struggle for emancipation.

Thus, historical materialism is far more than a theory—it is a method of revolutionary clarity. It demands that we look beneath appearances, beyond ideology, and into the structures that actually govern our lives. It teaches that change is not only possible but inevitable, driven by forces within the existing order that cannot be reconciled. And most importantly, it locates the agent of that change not in philosophers or saviors, but in the collective action of the working class itself.

Through this method, Marx and Engels armed the proletariat not just with critique, but with strategy. The world is not fixed. The current order is not natural. Humanity does not need to suffer under exploitation. With understanding, with struggle, and with unity, the oppressed can become the authors of history rather than its victims.

History does not move in a straight line. It advances through contradiction, crisis, and rupture—through the struggle between opposing forces locked in conflict. This is the dialectical understanding of history that Marx and Engels inherited from Hegel and transformed through the materialist lens of their own theory. Whereas Hegel saw dialectic as a process of unfolding ideas, Marx placed it squarely within the terrain of material life. Dialectical materialism, as their method came to be known, sees history as a dynamic process driven by the collision of opposing social forces, particularly those rooted in class divisions and the development of productive powers.

At the center of this dialectic stands the contradiction between the forces of production and the relations of production. Human beings, through labor, constantly develop new means of producing wealth—tools, techniques, knowledge, and organization. But these productive capacities do not evolve in isolation. They are embedded within specific social relations—property, class, and power. When the existing social relations become a barrier to the continued development of the productive forces, society enters into crisis. The old order can no longer contain the potential it has created, and a new order must be born through struggle.

This dialectical motion is not linear, nor is it peaceful. It involves tension, resistance, and often explosive transformation. Revolutionary change, in the Marxist view, is not an optional path or a utopian dream—it is the necessary resolution to the contradictions that build up within each mode of production. Just as feudalism crumbled beneath the rise of bourgeois capitalism, so too will capitalism be shattered by the growing contradictions between capital and labor. Each system contains within itself the seeds of its own dissolution.

The dialectic of history does not simply replace one ruling class with another—it moves toward the abolition of class society altogether. Whereas earlier revolutions exchanged one form of exploitation for another, the proletarian revolution aims to end the very conditions that make class rule possible. The working class, by virtue of its position in the productive process, has no special interest in owning or exploiting—it has an interest in abolishing the structures that divide humanity. This gives the proletarian movement its unique, universal character. Its emancipation is not a victory for one group over another—it is the liberation of humanity from domination.

In *Socialism: Utopian and Scientific*, Engels emphasized that socialism must arise not from moral wishes but from historical necessity. The dialectic reveals that capitalism contains irreconcilable contradictions: the pursuit of profit versus the satisfaction of human needs; the expansion of productive power versus the limitation of the market; the concentration of wealth versus the impoverishment of the masses. These contradictions are not surface defects—they are the engine of the system's own undoing.

Revolutionary transformation, then, is not merely the replacement of one government with another. It is the radical reorganization of society from the ground up. It means the dismantling of the capitalist state, the expropriation of the means of production from private hands, and the construction of new social forms—communal, democratic, and collectively controlled. The revolution is not a single event but a process: the overthrow of bourgeois rule, the consolidation of proletarian power, the reorganization of production, and ultimately the disappearing of the state itself as class antagonism disappears.

Dialectical thinking also equips the revolutionary movement with strategic clarity. It teaches that every advance will provoke resistance, that progress is uneven, and that setbacks are part of development. It cautions against fatalism and against triumphalism. History is not fated to unfold in our favor—it must be shaped by conscious action. But neither is it frozen or immune to change. No system, no matter how entrenched, can escape its own contradictions forever.

The dialectic reveals that capitalism's great achievements—the expansion of technology, the integration of global production, the development of socialized labor—are not signs of its permanence, but of its obsolescence. They demonstrate that humanity has outgrown private ownership, that the material conditions for socialism have already been created. What remains is the political act: the conscious intervention of the working class to resolve the contradictions through revolutionary transformation.

Marx and Engels armed the proletariat not only with a critique of the present but with a vision of the future grounded in the real motion of history. Through the dialectic, they showed that crisis is not a dead end—it is a turning point. Revolution is not chaos—it is the rational conclusion to an irrational system. And history, far from being a repetition of domination, is the path toward human emancipation—if we are bold enough to seize it.

Marx and Engels did not dream up socialism from thin air, nor did they construct it as a moral alternative based solely on human compassion. Their socialism was not the product of idealist speculation but the logical result of a rigorous analysis of capitalism's internal laws and historical trajectory. Socialism, in their view, was not just desirable—it was necessary. It was not a utopia to be imagined outside of history, but the next phase in the evolution of human society, made inevitable by the very development of capitalism itself.

To understand why socialism arises logically from capitalism, one must first recognize the enormous historical role that capitalism has played. It revolutionized the productive capacity of the human species. It broke the stagnant hierarchies of feudalism, shattered local economies, and created a world market. It unlocked science, technology, and urbanization at

a pace unmatched in any prior epoch. But in doing so, it also created the material conditions that render itself obsolete.

Capitalism socialized labor on an unprecedented scale. No longer do workers create goods in isolation or for their own local needs. They work in vast, interconnected systems of production—factories, supply chains, offices, logistics hubs—where each individual's labor contributes to a product they may never see or use. Yet while production is socialized, ownership remains private. This contradiction lies at the core of the system's instability. The modern economy is not the work of a few owners but of the global working class, and yet those few continue to own and control what is produced. This irrationality deepens with every advancement.

As capital accumulates, it tends toward concentration. Small producers are destroyed or absorbed. Markets consolidate. Wealth pools into fewer hands. Economic decisions become increasingly removed from the democratic sphere. At the same time, the working class grows —more people depend on wages, face the instability of markets, and live under the power of capital. The development of capitalism thus creates the two essential conditions for socialism: the concentration of productive power in the hands of a few, and the growing social force of the many who can reclaim it.

Socialism, therefore, does not require the invention of new productive forces—it requires the reorganization of what already exists. The vast wealth, the complex industries, the infrastructure, and the global reach of capitalism can all be turned toward human need, but only by abolishing private ownership and subordinating production to democratic control. The possibility of socialism lies not in fantasy, but in the mature fruits of capitalist development. The irrationality lies in allowing these forces to continue serving profit when they could serve humanity.

Marx and Engels also observed that capitalism repeatedly generates crises—not temporary breakdowns, but structural disruptions rooted in its internal contradictions. Overproduction and underconsumption, technological displacement of workers, ecological destruction, and financial collapse are not anomalies—they are the natural outcomes of a system that seeks profit above all else. Each crisis exposes the limits of private property and market anarchy, and each opens a space for revolutionary consciousness. The question is not whether capitalism will experience breakdowns—it is whether the working class will organize to transcend them.

This is why socialism cannot be reduced to charity, welfare, or regulated markets. These measures may soften the edge of capitalism for a time, but they do not alter its core structure. They cannot prevent the crises inherent in a system based on profit and exploitation. Real socialism means a change in class power: the end of private ownership of the means of production, the establishment of collective control, and the creation of a society where production is organized to meet needs, not to generate profit.

The path to socialism is made clearer, not cloudier, by the development of capitalism. Every innovation that displaces labor shows the absurdity of maintaining unemployment in a world

that needs care, education, and restoration. Every technological advance reveals the possibility of reducing the working day. Every global connection highlights our interdependence and the senselessness of borders in the face of common human challenges. Socialism is not a step back into primitive equality—it is a leap forward into a conscious and cooperative use of the power humanity already possesses.

Engels, in *Socialism: Utopian and Scientific*, argued that socialism is the solution to the contradiction between socialized production and private appropriation. It is not the imposition of an ideal but the conscious resolution of a conflict that capitalism itself has created. It is the moment when the working class seizes the productive powers it already operates, eliminates the parasitic class that lives off it, and begins to build a society on the basis of solidarity, equality, and freedom.

Thus, socialism is not a dream—it is the rational outcome of capitalism's own evolution. The dream is to believe that capitalism can last forever, that inequality will correct itself, that crises will cease, or that freedom can flourish under the rule of profit. The reality, shown through the method of historical materialism, is that the future belongs to those who create it. And history makes clear: it is the working class, not the capitalist class, who hold the key to that future.

But while socialism is the logical outcome of capitalist development, it does not follow automatically, like a law of nature unfolding without human will. As Marx later emphasized, the contradictions of capitalism, no matter how acute, will not resolve themselves. Crises alone do not bring about revolution—people do. Without conscious organization, without a revolutionary party, without a politically awakened and unified working class, the system can stagger on through crisis after crisis, adapting and renewing itself through violence, reform, or deception. Capitalism can survive its own disasters so long as the forces that oppose it remain disorganized or passive. Historical necessity opens the door, but it takes human agency—rooted in theory, strategy, and struggle—to walk through it. The leap to socialism requires more than ripeness of conditions; it demands decision, leadership, and the readiness of millions to seize history in their own hands.

In *Socialism: Utopian and Scientific*, Friedrich Engels mounted a decisive critique against the form of socialism that relied on moral appeals and abstract ideals. What he called "moral socialism" was widespread among early socialists who imagined a better world could be achieved simply by persuading the ruling class to adopt more ethical practices, or by constructing ideal communities through goodwill and reason. This approach, while well-intentioned, failed to understand the material and class-based nature of social reality. Engels argued that no lasting social transformation could be achieved by appealing to the conscience of exploiters, nor by dreaming of perfect societies outside the bounds of real historical development.

Moral socialism, in Engels' view, was politically impotent because it ignored the fundamental antagonism between classes. It saw exploitation not as a necessary outcome of a particular economic system, but as a deviation from justice or morality—something that could be corrected by education or enlightenment. But Engels made clear that exploitation

arises not from individual greed or cruelty, but from the very structure of capitalist production. As long as private property in the means of production exists, as long as capital accumulates through the extraction of surplus labor, as long as the worker must sell their labor power to survive, then exploitation is not a moral failing—it is the law of the system.

This is why Engels placed the class struggle, not morality, at the center of socialist politics. The transition to socialism could not come through consensus between classes, nor through the goodwill of the bourgeoisie. It could only come through the struggle of the proletariat—the class whose interests stand directly opposed to those of capital, and whose liberation requires the dismantling of the very foundation of bourgeois power. This struggle is not an ethical dispute; it is a material conflict over the control of the means of life.

Engels did not reject morality in general—he rejected the use of morality as a substitute for analysis and struggle. Appeals to justice that ignore the underlying relations of production are empty. They may inspire sentiment but cannot alter power. The bourgeoisie, whose wealth and authority depend on exploitation, will not surrender them because they are asked politely to do so. Nor will they be moved by utopian blueprints that imagine ideal societies while leaving intact the class structure of the present. History, as Engels insisted, does not bend to moral arguments—it is moved by material forces, and by the classes who act within them.

This critique was also directed at reformists who hoped to achieve socialism through gradual legislative change, piecemeal improvement, or cross-class cooperation. Engels understood that the state, as it exists under capitalism, serves the interests of the ruling class. Reforms may ease certain hardships, but they will always be limited, conditional, and reversible. Without the organized power of the working class, reforms become concessions granted from above, not victories won from below. And without a revolutionary break, the system's core mechanisms remain untouched.

Thus, Engels elevated the class struggle from a background process to the motor of history itself. It is through this struggle that the working class becomes a class for itself—aware of its interests, organized around its power, and capable of transforming society. The class struggle is not only a path to socialism; it is the process through which the working class develops its consciousness, solidarity, and capacity to rule. Through strikes, resistance, agitation, and political organization, the proletariat not only confronts the bourgeoisie—it transforms itself.

By discarding the moralistic and utopian fantasies of early socialism, Engels and Marx gave the movement a scientific foundation. They showed that socialism must emerge from the real conditions of capitalism, from the contradictions of its economy, and from the organized struggle of the class it exploits. They did not deny the desire for justice, freedom, and equality—but they located these aspirations in the material world, not in dreams or sermons. In doing so, they armed the working class with a clear understanding: that liberation will not be granted, it must be taken; and that history belongs not to the meek, but to those who struggle to make it.

The Proletariat as the Revolutionary Subject – Organization and Struggle

In *The Communist Manifesto*, Marx and Engels identified the proletariat not merely as one of many oppressed groups under capitalism, but as the uniquely positioned class whose liberation would mean the liberation of all humanity. Unlike previous oppressed classes in history, which often struggled only to replace their rulers with themselves, the proletariat has no property to protect, no new form of class domination to erect. It is a class that, by freeing itself from exploitation, abolishes the very conditions that make class exploitation possible. It is, therefore, a universal class—not by virtue of some moral superiority, but because its interests align with the ending of all class divisions.

This universality arises from the position the proletariat occupies within the capitalist mode of production. The worker produces the wealth of society yet owns none of it. Their labor is essential to every process of production, but they are denied control over the tools, the materials, the decisions, and the fruits of their work. The proletariat exists in every country, in every city, in every industry. It is not limited by nation, race, or gender, even if it is stratified and divided by these lines. Its common condition—alienation, exploitation, and dispossession—binds it together across borders and differences.

What makes the proletariat revolutionary is not only its suffering, but its centrality. It is not a marginal or passive victim of capitalism—it is its engine. The entire system depends on the continuous exploitation of labor. Without workers, no goods are produced, no services are delivered, no profits are made. This gives the proletariat enormous potential power. If organized and conscious, it can paralyze production, seize control of industry, and reconstruct society from the ground up.

The proletariat's universality is also ideological. Capitalist society fractures people into isolated individuals, fragmented identities, and competitive consumers. It teaches them to see their problems as personal, their neighbors as threats, and their workplace as just a job. But through struggle, the worker comes to understand their condition not as an individual misfortune but as a collective reality. Solidarity emerges—not just as a feeling, but as a social force. Class consciousness grows when workers recognize themselves in each other, when they see that the fight of one is the fight of all.

This is why Marx and Engels viewed the self-emancipation of the working class as the key to human freedom. The emancipation of the proletariat is not something that can be done for them by elites, intellectuals, or well-meaning reformers. It must be achieved by the workers themselves through their own organization, their own theory, and their own struggle. Only through this process can the working class destroy the institutions that exploit them and build new institutions based on equality, cooperation, and collective power.

In identifying the proletariat as the revolutionary subject, Marx and Engels were not making a prophecy—they were identifying a potential grounded in material reality. The proletariat is

not automatically revolutionary. Its consciousness can be shaped, its energies diverted, its unity broken. Capitalism actively works to fragment, pacify, and co-opt it. But the contradictions of the system continually push the working class back into conflict with capital. Crisis, degradation, and exploitation inevitably provoke resistance. The revolutionary potential of the proletariat lies not in its poverty but in its capacity for collective action and its indispensable role in the functioning of society.

Unlike previous classes that sought to seize power to continue exploitation in a new form, the proletariat, by abolishing class society, makes possible the full development of human beings. It opens the way for the end of alienated labor, the rational organization of production for human need, and the emergence of a society in which the free development of each is the condition for the free development of all.

Thus, the proletariat is not just another class—it is the last class. Its struggle is not for domination, but for liberation. Its victory would mean the end of all oppression rooted in economic exploitation. In raising itself up, the proletariat carries with it the whole of humanity, finally freed from the chains of class rule.

The working class, or proletariat, is not simply one among many social groups harmed by capitalism—it is the only class structurally capable of ending capitalism entirely. This is not a claim based on romanticism or idealism, but a conclusion drawn from a material analysis of how capitalism functions and what it depends upon. Capitalism is not sustained by ideology alone, nor by the will of capitalists or the machinery of the state. It survives and expands only through the continuous extraction of surplus value from labor. Without the working class, the system cannot produce, cannot accumulate, and cannot reproduce itself. It is the very heart of the economic engine—and therefore, it alone has the power to bring it to a halt.

Other classes and strata—such as the petty bourgeoisie, the middle class, the peasantry, and even sections of the intellectual elite—may experience hardship under capitalism, and they may participate in resistance movements. But these classes do not occupy the structural position necessary to fundamentally overturn the system. The petty bourgeoisie, often caught between capital and labor, may shift alliances depending on circumstance. The middle layers may clamor for reform, for fairer markets, for less corruption—but they do not confront the system at its root. Only the proletariat directly confronts capital at the point of production. Only the worker has their hands on the machinery that keeps the system running.

This is why Marx and Engels asserted that the emancipation of the working class must be the act of the working class itself. No outside force can substitute for this. Revolutionary theory, no matter how advanced, cannot change society unless it is embodied in the mass action of those who are exploited by the system and capable of dismantling it. Political parties, trade unions, and socialist organizations may serve as vehicles of this consciousness and coordination—but they cannot replace the independent action of the class as a whole.

The working class holds this potential because it is inherently collective. Unlike the bourgeoisie, which is divided by competition, and unlike the atomized consumer, the worker is brought together with others through the organization of production. Capitalism creates

vast workplaces, supply chains, and networks that tie millions of workers into a single process. Though often exploited in isolation, the conditions of labor create the foundation for solidarity and coordination. In struggle, these ties can be transformed into political unity.

Furthermore, the worker has nothing to lose but their chains. Capitalists fight to preserve private property because it guarantees their dominance. The middle class clings to its privileges, hoping to avoid proletarianization. But the proletariat owns no capital, no land, no business. It does not seek to preserve its position—it seeks to abolish the conditions that define it. This gives the working class a unique interest in the total transformation of society. Its goal is not to seize the wealth of the bourgeoisie and hoard it, but to abolish class divisions altogether, so that no one exploits and no one is exploited.

This is not to say the working class will automatically rise up or spontaneously become revolutionary. As Marxists such as Lenin recognized, the development of revolutionary consciousness requires more than economic suffering—it requires political education, experience in struggle, and organization. The system actively produces false consciousness, divides workers by race, gender, nationality, and ideology, and fosters the belief that resistance is futile or misguided. Overcoming these barriers requires deliberate effort, strategy, and leadership.

But even these obstacles do not negate the fact that only the working class has the power to fundamentally change the system. Every strike that halts production, every occupation that challenges property relations, every uprising that targets capitalist institutions points to the truth: the power of the bourgeoisie is not based on their ideas or strength—it is based on the continued cooperation of the very class they exploit.

Revolution is not merely a battle of wills—it is a reorganization of society from the bottom up. The working class, by virtue of its position, has the ability to not only destroy the capitalist system but to construct a new one in its place. It can collectivize production, democratize the workplace, and organize the economy around human needs instead of profit. This is not a dream, but a necessity—because so long as capitalism stands, the working class will continue to suffer, and the crises of the system will continue to deepen.

Thus, it is not only that the working class *can* overthrow capitalism—it is that no other force can. The end of capitalism will not come from above or from the margins, but from the center of its own productive process. When workers recognize their power, unite their struggles, and take aim at the system that exploits them, they do not merely protest injustice—they begin to make history.

While the working class holds the objective power to overthrow capitalism, this potential remains unrealized without the guiding force of revolutionary consciousness and organization. History does not unfold by economic conditions alone; it requires human intervention, strategy, and clarity of purpose. This is where communist theory and the revolutionary party play their essential role. They are not outside forces imposed upon the class but products of its highest level of consciousness—tools forged in the furnace of struggle to help the proletariat understand its task and carry it out.

Marx and Engels insisted that the role of communists is not to stand above or apart from the working class, but to represent its general interests, its historical direction, and its unity across local and national struggles. As stated in *The Communist Manifesto*, communists "have no interests separate and apart from those of the proletariat as a whole." Their distinction lies in clarity: a scientific understanding of the system, a historical view of the class struggle, and a commitment to organizing the working class into a force capable of revolution.

Communist theory provides the working class with a map of the terrain. It explains the dynamics of capitalism, the nature of exploitation, the role of the state, and the path toward emancipation. It exposes the illusions spread by bourgeois ideology—that capitalism is eternal, that class divisions are natural, and that reforms can bring justice. It reveals the systemic character of oppression and the necessity of collective, political action to overcome it. Without theory, the struggle remains spontaneous, fragmented, and easily co-opted. With theory, it becomes purposeful, strategic, and capable of winning power.

But theory alone is not enough. It must be embodied in organization. The revolutionary party serves as the collective memory and strategic center of the working class. It brings together the most advanced elements of the class, those who understand not only the need for revolution but the means to achieve it. The party is not a substitute for the class—it is its political expression. Its task is to connect struggles, raise consciousness, and lead with discipline and clarity when moments of crisis present revolutionary openings.

The importance of organization becomes even clearer when we examine the resistance faced by revolutionary movements. The bourgeoisie controls immense resources: media, education, law, police, military, and international alliances. It uses these tools to divide, confuse, and repress. Spontaneous uprisings, no matter how explosive, often lack the structure and unity needed to overcome such opposition. This is why revolutionary theory and the party are indispensable—not to dictate, but to coordinate; not to impose, but to unify; not to suppress initiative, but to channel it toward victory.

The party also plays a crucial role in preparing for revolution during non-revolutionary times. It educates, agitates, builds support in workplaces and communities, and develops leadership from within the working class. It defends gains won through struggle and resists the lure of reformist compromises that leave the foundations of capitalism intact. It understands that revolution is not a single act but a process, and it equips the class to move through that process with confidence and resolve.

This was most clearly articulated by Lenin, who developed the concept of the vanguard party—not as an elite body, but as a disciplined organization rooted in the most politically conscious layers of the class, capable of leading mass action when conditions ripen. Without such leadership, spontaneous rebellions often fall into confusion, fragmentation, or defeat. But with leadership grounded in communist theory and connected to real struggles, a revolutionary moment can be seized and sustained.

Ultimately, the task of the party is to merge the immediate struggles of the class with its ultimate goal: the abolition of capitalism and the construction of socialism. It does not wait for ideal conditions, nor does it impose a fixed blueprint. It studies the moment, adapts tactics, builds alliances, and moves always with the aim of turning class struggle into class power.

Revolution does not emerge by accident. It must be prepared, organized, and led. The working class can only fulfill its historical mission if it is equipped with the tools to understand and transform the world. Communist theory and the revolutionary party are those tools—not ends in themselves, but instruments of emancipation. Together, they form the bridge between possibility and reality, between suffering and liberation, between the world that is and the world that must be.

The history of working-class struggle is not only a chronicle of defeats and revolts—it is a living school of revolution. From the uprisings of 1848 to the heroic days of the Paris Commune in 1871, the proletariat has repeatedly risen to challenge the existing order. These moments, though often crushed by force, are not failures to be mourned—they are lessons to be studied, victories in clarity if not always in permanence. For Marx, Engels, and later revolutionaries like Lenin and Luxemburg, these episodes of class struggle provided concrete evidence that the working class is capable of seizing power, and offered essential insights into what it must do to hold it.

The revolutions of 1848 erupted across Europe like wildfire, ignited by economic hardship, political repression, and the growing confidence of the bourgeoisie and the emerging proletariat. In country after country—France, Germany, Austria, Hungary—the masses poured into the streets demanding democracy, national unity, and economic justice. The working class played a leading role in these upheavals, especially in Paris, where barricades once again defined the rhythm of revolution. But these movements were ultimately defeated, not because the people lacked courage, but because the leadership faltered, and the alliances were unstable. The bourgeoisie, having gained some measure of reform, turned against the workers, fearing their growing militancy.

From 1848, Marx and Engels learned a central lesson: the bourgeoisie is not a revolutionary ally once its own interests are secured. Its fear of proletarian power outweighs its opposition to feudal remnants. When confronted with the rising strength of labor, it will side with reaction and repression. Thus, the working class cannot rely on cross-class alliances based on vague democratic promises. It must build its own independent movement, with its own program, goals, and leadership.

Nowhere was the power and potential of the working class more vividly revealed than in the Paris Commune of 1871. After the French government's humiliating defeat in the Franco-Prussian War and the betrayal of the republic by bourgeois forces, the workers of Paris took history into their own hands. For 72 days, they governed the city—not in the name of abstract democracy, but in the name of the working class. They abolished the standing army, replaced the state bureaucracy with directly elected delegates subject to recall, established free education, and began to expropriate church property and support workers' cooperatives.

Though brief, the Commune demonstrated for the first time what a dictatorship of the proletariat could look like in practice—not the domination of a party over society, but the organized rule of the working class itself. Marx hailed it as "the political form at last discovered under which to work out the economic emancipation of labor." Its achievements, and its brutal suppression by the French state with the help of the Prussian army, made clear that the ruling class would stop at nothing to destroy a workers' government. The bloodbath that followed—tens of thousands executed or imprisoned—exposed the limits of relying on existing state structures to carry out a workers' revolution.

From the Commune, Marx and Engels drew another critical conclusion: the working class cannot simply take over the bourgeois state and use it for its own purposes. The existing state must be broken and replaced by new forms of power rooted in workers' democracy and mass participation. This insight laid the foundation for later revolutionary strategy, especially in the Russian Revolution of 1917, where Lenin and the Bolsheviks built upon the experience of the Commune to construct soviets—councils of workers and soldiers—as organs of revolutionary authority.

The rise of Stalin marked the betrayal of Marx, Engels, and Lenin. Where Lenin called for the power of the soviets—the collective rule of workers and peasants—Stalin built a new class of rulers, a bureaucratic elite who replaced the bourgeoisie but held the same power over the working people. The party of Lenin, once the organ of proletarian democracy, was turned into an instrument of command and repression. The capital and land, won by the workers' struggle, were seized again—not by private owners but by the new bureaucrats who used the state for their own privilege. Thus the banner of communism was stained with tyranny and dictatorship. The warning is clear: the new power that breaks the bourgeois state must never become a new power ruling above the working class. True communism demands the disappearance of all classes and the complete participation of all workers in directing society. China, Vietnam, and North Korea continue this Stalinistic system, not the true communism or socialism of Marx, Engels, and Lenin; their rule preserves a bureaucratic state above the workers and has merged partly with capitalism, turning socialism into a facade that hides exploitation and privilege.

These past struggles also revealed the dangers of delay, hesitation, and compromise. In both 1848 and 1871, moments of opportunity were lost because the leadership vacillated or hoped to avoid confrontation. But capitalism does not concede power without force. When the working class moves decisively, it must be prepared to confront the full strength of the ruling class—not only ideologically, but militarily. This does not mean glorifying violence, but recognizing the reality that the state exists to preserve property and order, and it will not disappear through polite negotiation.

Finally, these revolutions showed that the working class is capable not only of rebellion but of governance. The myth that workers are too ignorant, too chaotic, or too selfish to rule collapses in the face of historical fact. When given the chance, workers have organized services, maintained order, created new forms of democracy, and directed the course of

society. The problem is not capacity—it is the violent resistance of the bourgeoisie and the absence of sustained revolutionary organization.

The legacy of 1848 and the Paris Commune is both tragic and inspiring. Tragic in their suppression, but inspiring in their proof that another world is not only imaginable but already partially realized. They offer not blueprints, but lessons—warnings against reformist illusions, reminders of the need for independent working-class power, and examples of courage under fire. Above all, they confirm the central claim of Marxism: that the emancipation of the working class is possible, but only through struggle, and only through revolution.

Revolution is not an accident, nor a spontaneous eruption born from temporary outrage. It is the culmination of deep, historical contradictions in the capitalist system—but it does not unfold automatically. Its possibility becomes real only when the working class develops a clear understanding of its condition, its power, and its historic role. This understanding is what Marxists call proletarian consciousness: the transformation of the worker from an isolated laborer into a conscious political subject, aware of their place in society and prepared to act collectively to change it.

Proletarian consciousness does not arise solely from suffering. Oppression can lead to despair, division, or retreat into individual solutions. What turns suffering into struggle is organization, experience, and theory. Through strikes, protests, and political movements, workers begin to grasp the collective nature of their exploitation. They see that their enemies are not just their immediate bosses, but the system that gives those bosses power. In struggle, they develop solidarity—not as charity or sentiment, but as the practical recognition that their liberation is bound to that of their class brothers and sisters.

The role of communists, of revolutionaries, is to help make this consciousness general. That does not mean injecting ideas from outside, as if workers are blank slates. It means connecting immediate struggles to the broader system that produces them. It means helping workers see that wage cuts, layoffs, evictions, and racism are not isolated injustices but symptoms of a single disease—capitalism. When that connection is made, and when the class begins to organize not just for reforms but for power, the ground beneath the system begins to shake.

This process is uneven. The ruling class invests vast resources into maintaining ignorance, division, and cynicism. Schools teach obedience, not analysis. Media promote consumerism and nationalism. Even trade unions, when corrupted by bureaucrats, can serve to pacify rather than mobilize. Yet despite these obstacles, capitalism itself continually pushes workers into confrontation. Economic crises, inequality, war, and environmental collapse reveal the system's inability to meet basic human needs. They force people to question what was once taken for granted. In such moments, ideas that seemed radical become obvious. Masses that seemed passive move into action.

Marx and Engels understood that revolution does not come when people are ready—it comes when conditions make it necessary. But the outcome of such moments depends on

preparation. If the working class is organized, conscious, and led by a clear revolutionary program, the crisis can become a turning point toward socialism. If not, the ruling class can restore order—often through violence or fascism—and the opportunity is lost. Therefore, the building of proletarian consciousness is not a secondary task. It is central. It is what turns revolt into revolution, resistance into victory.

Revolution, then, is not a matter of desire or willpower—it is the inevitable resolution to capitalism's contradictions. As capital accumulates, as exploitation intensifies, as the crises multiply, the system approaches limits it cannot escape. The old world becomes unlivable. Either the working class seizes power and constructs a new society, or humanity descends into barbarism—perpetual war, ecological collapse, and deepening misery. The stakes are not abstract. They are material, immediate, and planetary.

But inevitability must not be confused with passivity. The collapse of capitalism will not usher in socialism automatically. Without class consciousness, organization, and struggle, breakdown can lead to reaction just as easily as it can lead to emancipation. History is not predetermined—it is contested. The task of revolutionaries is to ensure that when the decisive moment comes, the working class is ready to lead. That means building institutions of struggle, educating around socialist theory, organizing across lines of race, gender, and nation, and preparing the political instruments needed to fight for power.

Proletarian consciousness is not a finish line—it is a process, one that advances through victories, setbacks, debates, and practical experience. But once awakened, once the worker understands that their chains are not destiny but the product of a system—and that they have the power to break them—then the foundations of capitalism begin to crack. The ruling class fears nothing more than a conscious, united working class. Because when that class moves, it does not ask for justice—it takes it. It does not wait for history—it makes it.

Thus, the revolution is not only possible—it is necessary. It is not only desirable—it is demanded by the future. And its agent is not an abstract ideal or a benevolent elite, but the working class itself: organized, awakened, and determined to create a world in which the dignity and potential of every human being can finally be realized.

Beyond Capital – The Socialist Future and Human Emancipation

Socialism, as conceived by Marx and Engels, is not merely a different way of managing the existing system. It is not capitalism with kinder bosses, higher wages, or more efficient markets. It is the fundamental transformation of society from one based on exploitation, hierarchy, and profit to one rooted in cooperation, equality, and the satisfaction of human need. At the heart of this transformation lies the abolition of wage labor, class divisions, and the coercive state machinery that upholds them. These three pillars—wage labor, classes, and the state—are not natural or eternal; they are specific historical creations of capitalism and previous modes of production. To move beyond capital is to dismantle them entirely.

Wage labor is the mechanism through which capitalism extracts profit. The worker does not sell their labor, but their *labor power*—their capacity to work—on the open market, because they own no means of production and must work to survive. The capitalist pays the worker less than the value their labor produces, keeping the surplus as profit. This arrangement, though normalized, is a form of exploitation. The worker creates wealth they do not own and is alienated from the process, the product, and their own creative potential. Under socialism, this exploitation ends—not because work disappears, but because labor is no longer a commodity.

In a socialist society, the means of production are collectively owned and democratically controlled. Labor is organized not for private profit but for the benefit of society as a whole. Individuals contribute according to their abilities and receive according to their needs. Work becomes a cooperative activity rather than a coerced exchange. The social surplus is no longer appropriated by a class of owners but reinvested into public well-being: education, health, housing, culture, and leisure. With automation and technological advancement directed toward liberation instead of profit, the working day can be shortened, freeing time for human development rather than endless toil.

The abolition of wage labor leads directly to the abolition of class. Classes exist because of unequal access to the means of production. Under capitalism, the bourgeoisie owns and controls the productive apparatus, while the proletariat must sell their labor to survive. This division is the root of all social antagonism. Once private ownership is eliminated and production is organized to serve need rather than capital, this division dissolves. No one will have a structural interest in exploiting others. Economic relations will no longer be based on domination but on cooperation. The existence of classes as distinct social forces becomes unnecessary and obsolete.

Marx and Engels emphasized that socialism is not the end point, but the transition toward full communism—the stage in which class distinctions have disappeared entirely, and the principle of "from each according to their ability, to each according to their need" becomes reality. In this future, the very basis for economic compulsion is removed. Freed from the distortions of class society, individuals can pursue a wide range of social, intellectual, and creative activities, developing themselves as full human beings rather than as fragments of labor reduced to a single task.

The final structure to be overcome in this progression is the state. The modern state is not a neutral arbiter—it is the organized power of the ruling class, designed to maintain the conditions of exploitation. Its courts, police, military, and bureaucracy serve to defend private property of the elite, suppress dissent, and manage the contradictions of capitalist society. Even when formally democratic, it is shaped by and for bourgeois interests. Marx and Engels, especially in their analysis of the Paris Commune, recognized that the working class cannot simply take over the existing state and use it for its purposes. The state must be smashed—replaced by new forms of direct, participatory democracy rooted in the working class itself.

Under socialism, this workers' state—or dictatorship of the proletariat—is a transitional form. It is necessary to suppress the resistance of the old ruling class, to defend the

revolution, and to reorganize society on a new basis. But it is not a permanent institution. As class antagonisms dissolve, the state, too, begins to disappear. The coercive apparatus becomes redundant in a society where exploitation no longer exists. What remains is administration, not domination; coordination, not coercion. Political life becomes the democratic expression of a classless society, no longer a battlefield of competing interests but a space for collective deliberation and decision-making.

Thus, socialism is not about redistributing wealth within the capitalist system—it is about abolishing the very relations that produce inequality and domination. It means the end of wage slavery, the dissolution of class hierarchy, and the disappearance of the state as an instrument of repression. It is the beginning of a new social order in which the full potential of human beings can be realized—not as commodities, not as subjects, but as free and equal members of a cooperative world. This is the horizon Marx and Engels pointed toward—not as a distant dream, but as the concrete result of struggle, revolution, and conscious transformation.

At the core of the socialist vision lies a radical shift in how society organizes production: from private ownership and market anarchy to common ownership and conscious planning. This is not a matter of rearranging the existing capitalist system—it is the replacement of its very foundations. In place of an economy driven by competition, profit, and accumulation, socialism introduces a system grounded in cooperation, need, and sustainability. It is the rational use of resources by and for the people who produce them, directed not by the invisible hand of the market, but by the conscious decisions of the collective.

In capitalism, the means of production—factories, land, technology, infrastructure—are privately owned. A small minority controls the conditions of life for the vast majority. These owners make decisions not based on social usefulness but on their personal profitability. What gets produced, how much, and where is determined by what yields the highest return on capital. This system leads to absurd outcomes: mass hunger alongside food waste, housing shortages despite vacant buildings, and ecological destruction in pursuit of ever-higher margins. Scarcity is not natural—it is manufactured by a system that limits access based on market value, not human need.

Socialism overturns this system through common ownership. The land, factories, energy systems, and major industries become the property of society as a whole—not managed by distant shareholders or corporate boards, but collectively owned and democratically controlled. This does not mean that every individual manages everything, but that decisions about production are made through democratic institutions accountable to the people, not to capital. This change ends the separation between those who work and those who decide, between those who labor and those who profit. The economy becomes a public good, not a private empire.

Common ownership creates the basis for planned production. Planning is not the opposite of freedom—it is the condition for real freedom. In a planned economy, society determines its priorities: food, education, healthcare, housing, transportation, cultural development, ecological restoration. Resources are allocated according to need, not profit. Production is

coordinated to avoid waste, duplication, and crisis. Human beings are not reduced to consumers and workers but become active participants in shaping the direction of their lives and communities.

Marx and Engels envisioned such planning not as centralized bureaucracy for its own sake, but as the rational application of humanity's collective labor. They saw that capitalism had already created the infrastructure for planning—modern industry, global communications, mass logistics. What stood in the way was not technical capacity, but the private control over that capacity. Once liberated from the profit motive, those same tools could be repurposed to serve human ends. The great potential of science and technology, wasted on military production and advertising under capitalism, could instead be directed toward curing disease, mitigating ecological impact, and improving the quality of life for all.

This vision was echoed by Engels in *Socialism: Utopian and Scientific*, where he argued that the contradiction between the social nature of production and the private form of appropriation could only be resolved through conscious social planning. He rejected both anarchic market relations and rigid utopian schemes. Instead, he pointed to the actual motion of history: as production becomes increasingly social, the need for coordination, equity, and control becomes unavoidable. The chaos of the market, with its cycles of boom and bust, is not efficient—it is wasteful, irrational, and destructive.

Under planned production, the economy becomes transparent. No longer does a veil of commodity fetishism obscure the real relations between people and the products of their labor. Needs are assessed collectively, resources are mobilized deliberately, and outcomes are evaluated socially. Instead of competition between isolated firms, there is collaboration between sectors. Instead of exploitation, there is reciprocity. People do not work to enrich others—they contribute as part of a broader project of mutual development.

Of course, this planning must be democratic. Without participation, without accountability, planning can become authoritarian. But the remedy is not to return to market chaos—it is to deepen democracy. Workers and communities must have direct control over the decisions that affect their lives. Councils, assemblies, federations of workplace and neighborhood representatives—these are the organs of socialist planning. They replace the boardroom and the stock exchange with institutions rooted in popular power.

In this way, socialism restores purpose to production. It connects what is made to who needs it and why. It allows humanity to finally act as a conscious force in shaping its destiny. Common ownership and planned production are not technical fixes—they are social revolutions. They place the economy under the control of the people who make it work. And they lay the foundation for a society in which no one is hungry, homeless, or denied opportunity—not because of charity or luck, but because the economy is organized around the principle that all have the right to live and flourish.

In capitalist society, the state appears to stand above classes, acting as a neutral arbiter between competing interests. It presents itself as the guarantor of order, law, and individual rights. But Marx and Engels exposed this appearance as an illusion. The state, in its real

function, is the organized force of one class to dominate another. It is the instrument through which the ruling class protects its property, disciplines labor, enforces contracts, and suppresses dissent. Every institution—the courts, police, army, bureaucracy—is shaped by and for the preservation of class rule. Its laws reflect the needs of capital, not justice. Its democracy is limited by the power of wealth. Its neutrality is a mask for violence.

Under socialism, the function and form of the state must radically change. Once the working class has seized power and dismantled the bourgeois institutions that defended private property and exploitation, a new form of state emerges—not to perpetuate rule, but to complete the process of liberation. This workers' state does not mimic the old. It is based on direct participation, mass assemblies, delegates subject to recall, and decisions made at the base rather than imposed from above. It is not built to govern people, but to administer things and coordinate collective life.

Yet even this new state is not a permanent fixture. It exists as long as there are remnants of the old ruling class to resist and as long as class distinctions still shape social life. But as socialism deepens—abolishing private property, eliminating exploitation, and breaking down social hierarchies—the need for a centralized coercive apparatus begins to disappear. Coercion gives way to cooperation. The instruments of repression fall into disuse. The institutions once necessary for defense and control become redundant in a society no longer divided by antagonistic interests.

This disappearance is not an act of authority dismantling itself, but a process driven by transformation. As class divisions fade, and as the structures that once enforced inequality dissolve, the state loses its historical justification. What replaces it is not chaos, but a new form of social coordination based on genuine democracy. No longer alienated from the people, decision-making becomes rooted in everyday life—at the workplace, in the community, in federations of councils and assemblies. Democracy is no longer limited to voting once every few years for representatives disconnected from the people. It becomes a continuous, participatory activity, shaped by those it affects and accountable at every level.

This transformation of governance is only possible when the economy itself has been socialized. Without the abolition of private ownership, political equality is a shell. In capitalist democracies, the wealthy dominate through media, campaign financing, and control over economic resources. Even when formal rights exist, the power of money shapes every outcome. But when the means of production are in common hands, when production serves need and not profit, the conditions emerge for a real democracy—for the first time in history, the majority can govern in their own interest, without fear of dispossession or coercion.

In this new society, authority is no longer something imposed from above. It is expressed through shared responsibility. Coordination, administration, and planning still exist, but they are carried out by people chosen by and answerable to their communities. Decision-making is distributed, not concentrated. Differences are resolved not through force, but through collective deliberation and mutual understanding. The oppressive features of the old state—prisons, police, military hierarchies—fade from necessity. Order is maintained not through threat, but through solidarity and shared values.

True democracy cannot exist where class divides society. It cannot thrive under conditions where power is monopolized by wealth. Only when society has transcended the divisions of capital and labor, when the institutions of repression have disappeared, can democracy be realized in its fullest sense—as the free and conscious participation of all people in the decisions that shape their lives. This is not a utopia beyond reach. It is the logical conclusion of a revolutionary process that removes the material foundations of domination and creates, in their place, the foundations for freedom.

What disappears is not organization or coordination, but domination. The disappearance of the state marks not a retreat from political life, but its flowering. No longer does a separate power rule over society. Instead, society governs itself—deliberately, democratically, and collectively. This is the promise of socialism fulfilled: not the substitution of one authority for another, but the transformation of power itself, from an instrument of control into a means of shared liberation.

Socialism, as understood by Marx and Engels, is not the final destination of human social development, but a necessary transitional phase—a bridge between the collapse of capitalism and the emergence of a classless, stateless, and fully emancipated human society. It is a period defined by transformation, where the remnants of the old order are dismantled and the foundations of a new one are laid. During this phase, the working class holds political power and reshapes the economic and social structures inherited from capitalism to serve collective need instead of private profit. But socialism still carries within it traces of the past, which must be consciously overcome as society moves toward full communism.

At the point of socialist revolution, capitalism has not simply disappeared—it has been overthrown through struggle, and its institutions dismantled by the organized force of the working class. However, the habits, ideologies, and imbalances inherited from centuries of class rule do not vanish overnight. The transition must therefore involve both material and cultural change. Economically, this means expropriating the bourgeoisie and establishing collective ownership of the means of production. Socially, it means constructing new relations of cooperation, equality, and solidarity to replace those based on competition, hierarchy, and alienation.

In this transitional period, the principle of “from each according to his ability, to each according to his work” prevails. Since productive forces are not yet developed to the point where all needs can be freely met, and since social consciousness still bears the marks of class society, compensation remains linked to individual contribution. Some form of labor accounting and distribution still exists, though without the coercive structure of wage labor or the private appropriation of surplus. The difference lies in who controls production and to what end. Under socialism, the surplus produced by society is no longer siphoned into private hands, but reinvested into the collective good—into schools, housing, healthcare, infrastructure, and culture.

However, the goal is not to freeze this stage in place. Socialism is dynamic. Its purpose is to expand the productive base, deepen democratic participation, and eliminate social inequalities until the conditions emerge for full communism. As scarcity is overcome and the collective

wealth of society increases, the need for measured compensation diminishes. Labor becomes less about survival and more about creative expression and social contribution. Work becomes voluntary, varied, and self-directed. The coercive remnants of the division between mental and manual labor, between administration and execution, dissolve as education, access, and participation equalize.

Full communism is realized when society can implement the higher principle: “from each according to their ability, to each according to their need.” This is not an ideal imposed by force—it is a practical possibility made real by abundance, collective control, and the dissolution of class interest. In this society, the very concepts of class, exploitation, property, and the state lose their relevance. Human relations are no longer mediated by money or controlled by abstract market forces. Freed from the compulsion of labor, individuals are finally able to develop themselves in all directions—intellectually, emotionally, socially, and spiritually.

This transformation also means the end of the domination of nature by capital. Under capitalism, the environment is treated as an externality to be exploited for profit. Under socialism, and more so under communism, the relationship between humanity and nature becomes one of stewardship and balance. Planning allows for sustainable development; collective ownership removes the drive for overproduction; and the reduction of work hours gives people the freedom to engage with their world in a more meaningful and respectful way.

Importantly, Marx and Engels did not offer detailed blueprints for this future. They insisted that the form of communism must be determined by historical conditions and democratic processes, not by idealist schemes. What they provided was a scientific method for understanding social transformation—a theory grounded in material conditions and class struggle, open to adaptation, but guided by a clear direction: the abolition of exploitation and the full liberation of human potential.

Socialism is thus not an endpoint but a beginning. It is the phase where humanity takes control of its own development, replacing the blind laws of the market with conscious planning, and ending the centuries-long rule of wealth over labor. It is a transition that requires vigilance, creativity, and determination. But its purpose is clear: to build a society where freedom is not the privilege of a few, but the shared reality of all. A society where necessity no longer chains people to labor, and where the free development of each truly becomes the condition for the free development of all.

The culmination of the socialist project, as conceived by Marx and Engels, is not simply the reorganization of the economy or the replacement of one government by another. It is the birth of a new kind of human being, shaped not by competition, scarcity, and domination, but by freedom, cooperation, and consciousness. This vision of a new humanity stands in stark contrast to the alienated individual of capitalism—a being reduced to a worker, a consumer, a subordinate to capital. The aim of communism is not only to abolish the conditions that oppress people materially, but to unlock the full potential of human life in all its dimensions—social, creative, intellectual, and emotional.

Under capitalism, the human personality is stunted. From an early age, people are trained to obey authority, accept hierarchy, and treat others as rivals. Life becomes a series of transactions. Education is reduced to job training, art is commodified, and relationships are filtered through the market. The rhythm of life is dictated by the needs of capital—by wages, debts, clocks, deadlines, and profits. The individual is made to feel isolated, powerless, and interchangeable. Human creativity is confined to the margins, and the vast majority are denied the time and resources to develop their talents or explore their interests beyond survival.

The socialist future, by contrast, holds the promise of collective liberation. It envisions a world in which every person can participate fully in society without fear of hunger, homelessness, or humiliation. Freed from the daily anxiety of economic insecurity, people are finally able to engage with life on their own terms. Education becomes a lifelong process of discovery. Culture flourishes not as a product sold to the highest bidder, but as a shared treasure, created and enjoyed by all. Science and technology, no longer bent toward war or profit, become tools for healing, exploration, and understanding.

The new humanity is cooperative rather than competitive. No longer pitted against one another for survival, people work together for the common good. This cooperation is not forced or artificial—it emerges naturally when society is no longer structured around scarcity and domination. Mutual aid replaces market exchange. Solidarity becomes second nature. Social bonds deepen, not through imposed morality, but through the real experience of shared struggle and common purpose. In such a society, the suffering of one is felt by all, and the joy of one becomes the joy of the collective.

And perhaps most importantly, the new humanity is conscious. Conscious not only of the world, but of itself. No longer alienated from their labor, their communities, or their history, individuals begin to understand their role in shaping the world. They are no longer passive objects moved by forces they do not comprehend. They become active subjects—agents of transformation, capable of reflecting, deciding, and acting with intention. This consciousness is the foundation of true freedom—not the false freedom of market choice, but the real freedom to determine one's life, to act in solidarity with others, and to contribute meaningfully to the collective human journey.

Such a society is not a utopia in the sense of being perfect or static. It will have conflicts, challenges, and contradictions. But these will be addressed not through repression or exploitation, but through collective deliberation and democratic control. What defines this future is not the absence of problems, but the presence of the means to resolve them through solidarity, reason, and participation.

This is the horizon toward which socialism points—not merely the end of capitalism, but the beginning of a new civilization. A civilization where the fruits of centuries of labor and invention are shared by all. Where the distinction between mental and manual labor dissolves, and all forms of work are valued. Where cities and nature are no longer in opposition, but harmonized. Where borders and national rivalries fade, replaced by a global community rooted in peace and mutual respect.

Marx and Engels never claimed to predict the exact form this future would take. They offered no blueprints or rigid programs. Instead, they gave us the tools to understand the present and change it. They showed that history is not fate—it is made by human hands. And they pointed to the immense potential that lies within the working class—not only to end exploitation, but to remake the world.

The vision of a new humanity is not an abstraction. It is being born in every strike, every protest, every act of solidarity, and every moment when people reject injustice and fight for dignity. It lives in the collective memory of struggle and the dream of generations who refused to accept the world as it is. It is not a fantasy—it is a necessity. In an age of deepening crisis, war, and ecological collapse, the choice is no longer between capitalism and socialism—it is between barbarism and a new world.

That new world is waiting to be built. It calls for courage, clarity, and commitment. It calls for a revolution not only in institutions, but in how we see one another—and ourselves. It calls for the end of capital privatization, and the beginning of humanity.

Sources

The Communist Manifesto, Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, 1848

The German Ideology, Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, written 1845–1846

Capital, Volume I, Karl Marx, 1867

Capital, Volume II, Karl Marx (edited by Engels), 1885

Capital, Volume III, Karl Marx (edited by Engels), 1894

Socialism: Utopian and Scientific, Friedrich Engels, 1880

The Poverty of Philosophy, Karl Marx, 1847

Critique of the Gotha Programme, Karl Marx, 1875

Wage Labour and Capital, Karl Marx, 1847

Value, Price and Profit, Karl Marx, 1865

The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State, Friedrich Engels, 1884

Anti-Dühring, Friedrich Engels, 1878

The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte, Karl Marx, 1852

Revolution and Counter-Revolution in Germany, Friedrich Engels, 1851–1852

Letters on Historical Materialism (Marx–Engels Correspondence), Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels